WELFARE DATA TRACKING IMPLEMENTATION PROJECT

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

1. INTRODUCTION 4

1.1 PURPOSE 4
1.2 PROJECT OVERVIEW 4
1.3 RE-USE OF COMPLETED SAWS-TA PRODUCTS 6
1.4 APPROACH 7

2. ACRONYMS 11

3. IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY SUMMARY 13

3.1 INTRODUCTION 13
3.2 STRATEGY SUMMARY 13
3.3 STAKEHOLDER COMMUNICATION STRATEGY 13
3.4 DATA CONVERSION STRATEGY 14
3.5 SYSTEM ROLLOUT STRATEGY 14
3.6 TRAINING STRATEGY 14
3.7 CHANGE LEADERSHIP STRATEGY 15
3.8 HELP DESK AND CHANGE REQUEST 15

4. STAKEHOLDER COMMUNICATION STRATEGY 16

5. DATA CONVERSION STRATEGY 18

5.1 OBJECTIVE 18
5.2 INTRODUCTION AND DEFINITION 18
5.3 ASSUMPTIONS AND CONSTRAINTS 19
5.4 ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS 22
5.5 DATA CONVERSION ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS 27
5.6 SELECTED DATA CONVERSION STRATEGY 32
5.7 STRATEGY DETAIL 33

6. SYSTEM ROLLOUT STRATEGY 36

6.1 OBJECTIVE 36
6.2 INTRODUCTION AND DEFINITION 36
6.3 ASSUMPTIONS AND CONSTRAINTS 36
6.4 ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS 37
6.5 SYSTEM ROLLOUT ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS 40
6.6 SELECTED ROLLOUT STRATEGY 42
6.7 STRATEGY DETAIL 43

7. TRAINING STRATEGY 44

7.1 OBJECTIVE 44
7.2 INTRODUCTION AND DEFINITION 44
7.3 ASSUMPTIONS AND CONSTRAINTS 44
7.4 ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS 46
7.5 TRAINING ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS 49
7.6 SELECTED TRAINING STRATEGY 54
7.7 STRATEGY DETAIL 55

8. CHANGE LEADERSHIP STRATEGY 58

8.1 OBJECTIVE 58
8.2 INTRODUCTION AND DEFINITION 58
8.3 ASSUMPTIONS AND CONSTRAINTS 58
8.4 ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS 59
8.5 CHANGE LEADERSHIP ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS 61
8.6 SELECTED CHANGE LEADERSHIP STRATEGY 63

8.7 STRATEGY DETAIL 64
9. HELP DESK STRATEGY 65
INTRODUCTION AND STRATEGY DEFINITION 65
10. CHANGE REQUEST STRATEGY 66
INTRODUCTION AND STRATEGY DEFINITION 66

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of the Welfare Data Tracking Implementation Project (WDTIP) Implementation Strategy is to detail the Project's high level approach to the planning and execution of all of the WDTIP system implementation activities. This strategy is intended to outline the most effective and appropriate activities for the successful implementation of the new system, while minimizing costs and risks. Implementation activities refer to those activities that must be completed to roll out the new system once it has been developed and fully tested. These seven implementation activities include stakeholder communications, data conversion, system rollout, training, change leadership, change request and Help Desk procedures. The intent of the ***Implementation Strategy*** is to lay the foundation upon which the Project's detailed ***Implementation Plan*** can be built.

1.2 Project Overview

This section provides an overview of the WDTIP, delineating Project definition, purpose and objectives, and scope to provide the reader with the context for decisions made regarding the implementation strategy and associated activities.

1.2.1 Project Definition

The WDTIP is a system development project that includes overall project management; designing, building and testing the system; developing and executing user training; communicating with internal and external stakeholders; and deploying the system. In addition, data will be converted from county systems to the WDTIP database. It is anticipated that this data conversion will entail both automated and manual methods. Subsequent ongoing batch data loads from the counties are also included in the WDTIP. The scope of the Project is further discussed in the ***1.2.3 Project Scope*** sub-section of this document.

1.2.2 Project Purpose and Objectives

In response to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) of 1996, the State of California passed Assembly Bill (AB) 1542. AB-1542 institutes the Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF) program in California and imposes welfare time limits, as well as new programmatic and eligibility rules. In addition to welfare time limits, AB-1542 mandates work requirements through the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program. As a result of the CalWORKs program, county welfare departments are required to have a mechanism to track eligibility time limits, and other related data on an individual level, across counties and over time to comply with the tracking requirements of both State and Federal mandates.

The purpose of the WDTIP, therefore, is to provide a communication mechanism and central data repository that can be accessed by all technology-enabled counties and relevant agency systems in order to meet the requirements of Statewide Automated

Welfare System (SAWS) legislation and the TANF and CalWORKs programs. WDTIP addresses the immediate need for Federal and State Welfare Reform tracking requirements imposed by the Federal PRWORA, AB-1542 and relevant All County Letters (ACLs) issued by the California Department of Social Services (CDSS).

To this end, the objectives of the Project are to satisfy the aforementioned legislative requirements by providing a statewide repository for Welfare Reform data elements and to facilitate communication between disparate county welfare and statewide welfare-related systems. The primary data to be collected, calculated (if necessary), and tracked for applicants/recipients includes:

- TANF 60-Month Clock
- CalWORKs 60-Month Clock
- Welfare to Work (WTW) 18/24-Month Clock

1.2.3 Project Scope

The overall objective of the WDTIP is to provide a communication mechanism and central data repository that can be accessed by all technology-enabled counties and relevant agency systems. In addition, it must enable counties to meet the requirements of Welfare Reform. The scope of the WDTIP includes design, construction, testing and implementation of a system that will allow all 58 California counties to accurately track individual welfare recipient information to meet the requirements of both State and Federal Welfare Reform. The Project also consists of the development of Customer Information Control System (CICS) screens to view data and 10 operations and management reports. A one-time data conversion of county data will be required for the initial load into the database with subsequent ongoing loads performed by counties. Examples of data to be tracked include:

- PRWORA time clock calculation
- CalWORKs time clock calculations, including exceptions and exemptions
- Diversion program and payment information
- Sanction information to provide appropriate CalWORKs sanction data across counties

The data conversion of county data to populate the WDTIP database will be a vital component of the WDTIP. Understanding that some counties do not maintain the level of historical data necessary to initially provide information required for accurate time clock calculations, the quality of the data and the resulting time clock calculation will improve as counties begin using the system to collect and maintain the required time tracking data elements. Therefore, the Project scope includes the following data conversion activities: design, development, testing and implementation of conversion programs including, but not limited to, the following:

- Identification of required county data elements to populate the WDTIP database
- Identification of county file format requirements

- Development of edit and error processing rules
- Assistance with the one-time initial data conversion
- Development of ongoing load requirements for county data into the WDTIP database
- County technical resource guidance for development of extract requirements

In addition, the scope of the Project will include the following implementation activities:

- Regional training sessions
- Regional information sessions
- County visits as needed
- Consistent and ongoing communication with stakeholders
- Implementation support

The scope of this Project does not include:

- Resources to convert county data into a standard file for data conversion and ongoing data loads
- Assisting agencies/counties with the design and development of county welfare system screens to view WDTIP data
- Development or management of any changes to the Statewide Client Index (SCI) system

1.2.3.1 County Data Conversion

Because Medi-Cal Eligibility Data System (MEDS) does not supply all the needed data, SAWS Information System (SIS) cannot currently provide complete data tracking or correctly calculate cumulative time-on-aid. To calculate accurate time clock data, the WDTIP database must be populated with direct county data via a one-time data conversion and ongoing updates. The WDTIP Team, with the input of counties, will develop conversion specifications and a standard file format to support each county's conversion and update efforts.

Each county will then be responsible for providing the conversion data files to populate the WDTIP database. Ongoing data files will be provided by either the individual county or the associated consortium system. County technical resources will be needed to produce the conversion extract. It is important that all counties participate in this conversion effort in order to generate complete, accurate and meaningful data.

1.3 Re-use of Completed SAWS-TA Products

Since WDTIP builds upon the work completed during SAWS Technical Architecture (SAWS-TA), reuse of many SAWS-TA products was anticipated. As examples, work initiated for SAWS-TA business requirements and stakeholder communications was used as the foundation for the **Updated Business Requirements Document** and the **Updated Stakeholder Communication Plan**. Additionally, SAWS-TA change request and Help

Desk procedures will be incorporated into both this **Implementation Strategy** and finally the **Implementation Plan.**

1.4 Approach

This document provides the high level strategy for the seven WDTIP implementation activities: stakeholder communications, data conversion, system rollout, training, change leadership, change request and Help Desk procedures. A communication strategy was determined during the first months of the WDTIP, and incorporated into the **Updated Stakeholder Communication Plan**, that was completed in June 1999. The remaining four implementation activities – data conversion, system rollout, training and change leadership – represent new activities to the WDTIP and warrant detailed analysis to determine the direction the WDTIP will take. The list below details the status of each of the seven components, and our high level approach to determining the best solution for implementing each of these activities.

- **Stakeholder Communications** – Stakeholder communications includes all the external two-way communications conducted to educate, inform and solicit information about the WDTIP.

  A strategy and an implementation plan have already been developed for stakeholder communications. The **Updated Stakeholder Communication Plan** was approved in June 1999.

- **Data Conversion** – Data conversion is the process used to initially populate the WDTIP database with county-specific data and to conduct ongoing data updates.

  Since the commencement of WDTIP, a considerable amount of information has been gathered to develop the strategy for the conversion of county-specific data. In June 1999, the WDTIP Team solicited information from county representatives during the Joint Requirements Planning (JRP) session. In July 1999, the Team sent a conversion survey to all 58 counties and conducted follow-up interviews to determine the most appropriate approach. Lastly, a meeting specifically targeting conversion issues was held during the Joint Application Design (JAD) session in August 1999. This strategy incorporates the results of the meetings, survey and interviews and will detail the next steps for data conversion. This strategy also includes an evaluation of alternatives the Project considered during the design of data conversion and a justification for the selection made.

- **System Rollout** – System rollout is the process by which the new screens and system functionality are made available to the end users.

  This strategy is closely linked to the data conversion strategy and essentially drives the training strategy. The analysis for this strategy includes an evaluation of alternatives that were considered and justification for the selection made.

- **Training** – Training is defined as the formal instruction of county trainers on the WDTIP system. County trainers will be trained to make online inquiries, navigate through screens, read reports, and perform online data transactions including the ability to add, update and delete. These trainers, in turn, will then train appropriate members of their staff.

- **Change Leadership** – For the purposes of WDTIP, change leadership is defined as the process by which business process changes resulting from the WDTIP implementation are identified and implemented in the counties.

  The change leadership process is undertaken when a new automated system is being implemented and there is a need to integrate the new automation into the business workflow. Our goal is to assist counties in determining how to incorporate the new system into their current business processes especially in the business areas of file clearance and eligibility determination. This strategy includes an evaluation of alternatives and justification for the selection made.

- **Help Desk Procedures** – The WDTIP Help Desk will provide support to the counties during implementation and throughout the life of the WDTIP system. Users and other stakeholders can access the Help Desk via phone, facsimile, e-mail and regular mail to obtain assistance with or ask questions about the application, screens, reports and connectivity of the system. Users and other stakeholders may also obtain information on current and future Project activities, as well as Project status.

  Help Desk procedures were developed during the SAWS-TA Project. Because most of the procedures for the Help Desk are still valid, these processes will be updated to meet the requirements of the WDTIP. The strategy details how these procedures will be updated.

- **Change Request Processing** – Change request is a process that provides stakeholders, including users, a method to request changes, corrections or enhancements to the WDTIP system.

  Change request procedures were developed during the SAWS-TA Project. Because most of the procedures for change requests are still valid, these processes will be updated to meet the requirements of the WDTIP. The strategy details how these procedures will be updated.

The **Implementation Plan**, due for completion on January 28, 2000, will provide the detailed, step-by-step approach to implementing each of the strategies.

1.4.1 Objectives

The following are specific objectives of the WDTIP implementation strategy:

- Determine the most appropriate (effective and efficient) implementation strategy for the WDTIP

- Evaluate options within the change leadership, training, data conversion and rollout strategies. The activities completed to evaluate the options within each of the strategies are included below:
  - Describe possible scenarios for implementation
  - Identify evaluative criteria and constraints that impact the implementation and define the risks to achieving success
  - Evaluate each of the scenarios by using the specific criteria
  - Select the most appropriate strategy
  - Provide detail about how the strategy will be further developed into a plan

- Identify and update, if necessary, already-developed strategies, plans and procedures in place for the Help Desk and change request procedures as well as the stakeholder communication strategy

1.4.2 Assumptions and Constraints

Assumptions as they relate to the specific implementation areas are discussed in subsequent sections of this document. However, the following general assumptions have been made regarding the WDTIP implementation effort:

- The State will provide adequate resources to manage the implementation effort.
- Counties will be able to work within the aggressive WDTIP implementation schedule.
- Counties and the four consortium groups will be responsible for specific activities (i.e., converting data and training end users).
- The components of the implementation strategy were developed in the same order that they appear in this document. Once a component strategy was developed, the remaining strategies were then built on the assumptions already made and the alternative approaches that had been selected. For example, the rollout strategy analysis builds on the data conversion strategy selected, and the training strategy builds on the rollout strategy selected.
- The Pre-SAWS database or Pre-SAWS system is a term that will be used to describe the system that was developed and implemented during the SAWS-TA Project. The terms “WDTIP database” or “WDTIP system” will be used to describe the new database and new system into which data will be converted.

The following are constraints to successfully implementing the WDTIP system:

- Counties have limited resources to complete implementation activities (i.e., data conversion, training and change leadership activities).
- Not all counties can provide all the historical data necessary to accurately calculate the initial time clocks.
- The WDTIP has limited and relatively fixed resources available to implement the new system.

1.4.3 Potential Barriers to Effective Implementation

The following risks specific to the WDTIP have been identified through a joint effort by project management, external quality assurance (Q/A), and the Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V) vendor. These risks represent potential barriers to the successful implementation of the WDTIP system, and were considered as we determined our implementation strategy:

- General lack of knowledge in the counties about the Project objectives, time frames and system functionality
- General lack of county buy-in
- General lack of county commitment to the Project
- Dependence on individual counties' data for successful conversion
- History of scope change and scope creep
- Minimal State and county resources for training, data conversion and rollout activities
- Competition from other county implementation projects (e.g., Y2K, Welfare Reform, Consortium system implementation, EBT)

2. Acronyms

The following is a list of commonly used acronyms on the WDTIP and in this document.

Table 2-1: Acronym List

Acronym	Phrase/Name
AB	Assembly Bill
ACL	All County Letter
CalWORKs	California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids
CCB	Change Control Board
CDSS	California Department of Social Services
CICS	Customer Information Control System
CIN	Client Index Number
C-IV	Consortium IV
CDHS	California Department of Health Services
EBT	Electronic Benefit Transfer
GEARS	GAIN Employment Activity and Reporting System
GEMS	GAIN Employment Management System
GIS	GAIN Information System
HHSDC	California Health and Human Services Agency Data Center
ISAWS	Interim Statewide Automated Welfare System
IV&V	Independent Verification and Validation
JAD	Joint Application System Design
JRP	Joint Requirements Planning
LEADER	Los Angeles Eligibility, Automated Determination, Evaluation and Reporting System
MAGIC	Merced Automated Global Information Control
MEDS	Medi-Cal Eligibility Data System
PRWORA	Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act
PTS	Project Tracking System
Q/A	Quality Assurance
SAWS	Statewide Automated Welfare System
SAWS-TA	Statewide Automated Welfare System – Technical Architecture
SCI	Statewide Client Index
SFIS	Statewide Fingerprint Imaging System
SIS	SAWS Information System

Acronym	*Phrase/Name*
TANF	Temporary Assistance for Needy Families
TOA	Time-on-Aid
WCDS	Welfare Case Data System
WDTIP	Welfare Data Tracking Implementation Project
WICAR	Ventura County's Eligibility System
Y2K	Year 2000

3. Implementation Strategy Summary

3.1 Introduction

This section summarizes the overall implementation strategy of the WDTIP. The approach discussed here is based on the more detailed analyses documented in sections 4 through 8 of this document.

3.2 Strategy Summary

This **Implementation Strategy** is broken down into seven sub-strategies, each of which is discussed in later sections of the strategy. These sub-strategies address the following activities:

- Stakeholder Communication (Section 4)
- Data Conversion (Section 5)
- System Rollout (Section 6)
- Training (Section 7)
- Change Leadership (Section 8)
- Help Desk (Section 9)
- Change Request (Section 10)

To determine the WDTIP strategy for each of these implementation activities, the WDTIP Implementation Team identified the various options available to the Project to accomplish each activity. For example, in discussing the Project's alternatives to execute system rollout, the WDTIP Team determined that we could either rollout the new system (1) concurrently, that is, rollout all counties at the same time or (2) by phasing counties over a two-month period of time. Based on specific evaluation criteria, assumptions and constraints, we completed an analysis of the benefits and drawbacks of each approach, and identified the strategy that would best meet the needs of the counties and the State.

The paragraphs below outlines the Project's implementation strategy. It is based on our evaluation of all viable options and, we believe, represents the best approach to implementing the new WDTIP system.

3.3 Stakeholder Communication Strategy

Our strategy for determining how the Project will communicate with and receive communications from WDTIP stakeholders was determined by first identifying our stakeholders and then determining the communication methods appropriate for each stakeholder. The **Updated Stakeholder Communication Plan**, which was submitted and approved in June 1999, specifically outlines with whom the Project will communicate, how the communication will be executed, and how often the communication will occur.

3.4 Data Conversion Strategy

The selected data conversion strategy emphasizes a hybrid approach to data collection. For both the initial data conversion and ongoing data loads, data will be collected using three distinct methods. These include:

- **Standard County File**: Each county will extract and send to the WDTIP database, via a file transfer protocol, the data elements required for the calculation of the TANF and CalWORKs time clocks. This data includes, for example, program participation and exceptions and exemptions.

- **MEDS:** The California Department of Health Services (CDHS) will extract from MEDS and transfer to the WDTIP database data elements not required for calculation of the TANF and CalWORKs time clocks. This data includes, for example, Alien Number.

- **Online input**: Counties will manually input data elements not retained in automated systems. These data elements are restricted to child support reimbursement, non-California program participation, Supportive Services Only and Diversion.

Data conversion will be phased by county (or by several counties at once), and will end no later than July 31, 2000.

3.5 System Rollout Strategy

The selected system rollout strategy will work in conjunction with both the training and data conversion approaches. All 58 counties will be given concurrent access to the new screens and system functionality. To ensure counties do not lose any current Pre-SAWS functionality during the transition from Pre-SAWS to WDTIP, the Project will load the new WDTIP database with Pre-SAWS SIS data using the standard file format and conversion load programs. As county data conversions are phased incrementally over a one- to two-month period, the SIS derived data will be updated with county specific data from the converting county or counties.

3.6 Training Strategy

The training strategy provides a flexible method to train county trainers, and provide them tools to train their own county staff. All county trainers will be trained prior to system rollout, and be allowed sufficient time and effective training materials to facilitate the training of their own staff. County trainers will be trained beginning six weeks prior to rollout. Those counties trained earlier in the schedule will be those that require additional time to develop county training programs and execute staff training (it is anticipated that these will be the larger counties that require a little extra time). Those counties trained later in the schedule will be those who prefer to give "on the job" training in the production environment (it is anticipated that these will be smaller counties with fewer staff to train).

3.7 Change Leadership Strategy

The change leadership strategy will work together with both the training strategy and the **Updated Stakeholder Communication Plan**. To help counties identify and implement new business process changes, the WDTIP Implementation Team will identify the high-level business processes impacted by the new system. These processes, no doubt, will be in the business areas of file clearance and eligibility determination. The Implementation Team will document the generic changes to business processes, and assist counties determining the specific business processes to implement in their respective counties. The Team will accomplish this by developing business analysis templates to assist counties with identifying changes. The Project will communicate to counties the high-level business process impacts and provide them a sound approach to complete a detailed analysis in their respective counties. The media that will be utilized to communicate business process changes include, but are not limited to, WDTIP regional meetings, training sessions, the WDTIP Information Letter, consortia specific meetings and the Help Desk Bulletin.

3.8 Help Desk and Change Request

The purpose of the WDTIP Help Desk will be to provide support to the counties during implementation and on-going use of the WDTIP system. Users will be able to access the Help Desk via phone, fax, e-mail and regular mail to obtain assistance with or ask questions about the application, screens, reports and connectivity of the system. Users will also be able to obtain information on current and future Project activities, as well as on Project status. The WDTIP Team will develop detailed Help Desk procedures that will build upon the already proven procedures of the SAWS-TA Project. Second level WDTIP Help Desk support will be provided by HHSDC staff located at the Cannery site.

Change request is a process that provides stakeholders, including users, with a means to request changes, corrections or enhancements to the WDTIP system. The change request and Help Desk strategies are closely linked (i.e., the Help Desk will serve as the vehicle for users and individuals external to the Project to request changes to the system).

Upon submission of a request, the Help Desk staff will document the request and forward it to the Change Control Board (CCB) where formal change request procedures will be initiated. These procedures include discussions regarding the best approach to resolving the request, approvals, execution and communication of the change. If the change request is deemed not to be within scope, the CCB will notify the Help Desk staff who will then notify the requestor and track the interaction. If it is accepted, the CCB will notify the Help Desk staff of the acceptance and they will then notify the requestor and track the subsequent development activities for purposes of updating the appropriate staff. All change requests will be tracked using the Project Tracking System (PTS) database. Proven change request procedures were developed during the SAWS-TA Project and will be enhanced for the WDTIP.

4. Stakeholder Communication Strategy

Because the new system will impact the way business is currently done in California's welfare departments, timely, consistent and adequate communication of information to potentially impacted stakeholders is essential for the Project's success. Stakeholders should understand the details regarding the functionality of the new system, the implementation efforts, and the resulting impact on individual roles, as well as how utilization of the new system may affect current business processes. In addition, it is also important that the communication approach provides the structure for a feedback mechanism to ensure stakeholders have the ability to effectively communicate with the WDTIP Team.

Due to the importance of the communication efforts, the communication strategy and plan were developed early in Phase 1 of the WDTIP. The document that resulted is called the **Updated Stakeholder Communication Plan**. The objectives of this Plan include the following:

- Inform internal and external stakeholders
- Enroll stakeholders and promote change
- Prevent un-channeled communication and curb rumors
- Obtain feedback from stakeholders
- Generate enthusiasm and excitement
- Support the change leadership process

In developing a formal communications program, the following determined the specific task assignments and schedule for communications:

- The current and desired situation and environment
- The stakeholders involved
- Information needs (i.e., message, frequency, messenger)
- The most effective communications media

To accomplish the above, the **Updated Stakeholder Communication Plan** includes the following sections:

Section I **Overview** – This section provides a high level overview of the Project as well as expresses the importance of communication efforts. This section also includes the communication objectives, potential barriers to communication, expected benefits of a formal communication plan, the factors that will be critical to the plan's success, and the assumptions specific to successful communications.

Section II **Stakeholders** – This section identifies the stakeholders that will be affected by the system implementation and therefore will need to be communicated to on some level. Understanding the various stakeholders

and their specific information needs and their ability to influence and affect outcomes is critical to the implementation effort.

Section III **Message Types** – Once the stakeholders are identified, the types of messages that will need to be communicated to them must be identified. This section includes a list of those message types with their respective descriptions.

Section IV **Communications Media** – This section outlines the communications media appropriate for not only the type of message that will be disseminated, but also the audience (stakeholders) to which the message will be communicated.

Section V **Approval Process** – This section includes a formal communications approval process. This approval process is intended to ensure that messages to be disseminated are consistent and appropriate. Additionally, because one of the critical success factors of a communication effort is the timeliness of messages, it is important that all Team members responsible for communications understand this process so messages are not unnecessarily delayed.

Section VI **Media Matrix** – The media matrix was developed to provide the reader with more specific information regarding the various communications media. The matrix includes each of the media identified as appropriate for our purposes and then describes the media's format, frequency, tone and level of detail, how the media will be used for our purposes, and finally the target audience we should expect to reach.

Section VII **Communication Strategy Matrix** – The communication strategy matrix was developed to provide the reader with the strategy for developing and delivering communications targeted to the individual audiences, meet the communications objectives, and convey the appropriate messages. The matrix includes audience, objective of communication, the message, the method to be used, the party responsible for communicating the message, and the timeframes in which the message will be communicated.

In addition to the above, the **Updated Stakeholder Communication Plan** includes various stakeholder contact lists as well as a high level schedule of communication activities.

5. Data Conversion Strategy

5.1 Objective

The objective of the data conversion strategy analysis is to identify and examine the various options considered to initially populate the WDTIP database with county data, and to conduct ongoing data updates. The goal of the analysis is to select the strategy that best suits the needs of the State and counties, given specific assumptions and constraints.

5.2 Introduction and Definition

For the purposes of this analysis, data conversion is defined as the process by which:

- The WDTIP database will be initially populated with county specific data elements necessary to meet the business requirements of the new system
- The WDTIP database will be updated regularly to reflect changes to the affected data

Initial data conversion and ongoing updates can be accomplished in three distinct ways:

- **Automated method**: This method is the process of populating the new database by extracting the required data elements from one or more systems using automated data conversion programs and tools, transferring the data electronically via a file transfer protocol, and loading the data into the new database through load programs. This method requires system coding to extract data from the originating system(s) and to transfer the data to the source database. It also requires the development of data loading programs to load the data into the new database, as well as a method to receive data updates.
- **Manual method**: This method is the process of converting data using online input into the database. This method requires staff to input the initial data load and ongoing data updates using online screens in the production environment, and requires the full development and roll out of the new system prior to the commencement of data conversion activities.
- **A mix of automated and manual methods**: This method is the process of populating the database using a combination of the above mentioned methods. Generally speaking, this method is utilized when an automated approach is preferred, but manual input is required for those data elements retained in physical case folders.

This analysis will result in the identification of the best approach to populating the WDTIP database with the data necessary to meet the business requirements of the new system. Each of the alternative strategies discussed is an automated, manual or a hybrid approach to data conversion.

It is imperative that the WDTIP database contains the data elements necessary to calculate and display specific recipient tracking information to help eligibility workers determine one-time and ongoing eligibility to the CalWORKs program. This information includes:

- Diversion Information
- TANF 60-Month Clock
- CalWORKs 60-Month Clock
- WTW 18/24-Month Clock

One of the significant challenges of the strategy will be to develop an approach to convert historical data required to calculate the TANF and CalWORKs 60-month clocks. The CalWORKs program dictates that non-exempt recipients receive cash assistance for no more than 60 months, commencing January 1998. TANF rules dictate that non-exempt recipients receive federally funded cash assistance for no more than 60 months, commencing December 1996. These rules necessitate the conversion of historical data dating as far back as December 1996. This data may not be easily accessible, since many counties have recently converted to new eligibility systems (and did not convert history), have already archived or purged this historical data, or store this data in paper case folders.

The SIS database is currently populated with MEDS and MEDS-derived data. Although MEDS cannot provide all of the mandatory elements required to calculate the above bulleted data, the data conversion strategy must ensure current Pre-SAWS functionality is not diminished in the transition to the new system.

5.3 Assumptions and Constraints

For the purpose of this analysis, specific assumptions have been made and constraints identified that impact our analysis. The assumptions and constraints are listed below:

5.3.1 Assumptions

- State resources shall be assigned to assist with data conversion and rollout activities. These resources will assist with developing the data conversion plan, and work with external agencies and counties to promote buy-in.
- Most of the required data elements for conversion reside in a variety of systems. These include the county welfare systems, county employment services systems and MEDS.
- The following data elements, which are required for the calculation of time clocks, may not reside in all counties' automated systems: child support reimbursement, Diversion, Supportive Services Only, and non-California program participation information.
- WDTIP has received a waiver from Executive Order D-3-99 that limits new project approvals to only those projects legislatively mandated or related to Year 2000 (Y2K) corrective activities.
- All counties or their vendor representative are technically able to provide a single data file (one-time and ongoing), regardless of the number of systems from which data is extracted.

- Individual counties are responsible for conversion data mapping and extraction activities.
- DHS shall continue to provide limited MEDS data to populate the WDTIP database.
- Per the Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) Project schedule, EBT activities will not impact the WDTIP implementation, since design activities for that project do not begin until 2001.
- Per the Statewide Fingerprint Imaging System (SFIS) Project schedule, SFIS activities will not impact the WDTIP implementation effort.
- There are no specific schedule constraints that would prevent MEDS and Statewide Client Index (SCI) projects from completing WDTIP data conversion activities by July 2000.
- There are eight eligibility systems from which data must be extracted. Each of the 58 counties utilizes one of these systems. These systems include:

  1. Interim Statewide Automated Welfare System (ISAWS)
  2. Time on Aid (TOA) System
  3. Riverside County's Eligibility System
  4. Ventura County's Eligibility System (WICAR)
  5. Merced County's Eligibility System (MAGIC)
  6. Stanislaus County's Eligibility System
  7. Los Angeles County's Eligibility System (LEADER)
  8. San Bernardino County's Eligibility System

- Each county utilizes various employment services systems to administer the WTW program. These may include, but are not limited to the GAIN Information System (GIS), the GAIN Employment Management System (GEMS), the GAIN Employment Activity and Reporting System (GEARS) and county developed systems.
- The county and consortia attendees at the JAD session provided accurate information regarding the data conversion capabilities of the counties' and consortia systems.
- The Pre-SAWS database or Pre-SAWS system is a term that will be used to describe the system that was developed and implemented during the SAWS-TA Project. The terms "WDTIP database" or "WDTIP system" will be used to describe the new database and the new system into which data will be converted.

5.3.2 Constraints

- County data is required from December 1996 to meet the data tracking requirements of TANF.
- Although Merced, Ventura and Welfare Case Data System (WCDS) counties maintain data from December 1996 in archived files, ISAWS, LEADER, Stanislaus, San Bernardino and Riverside counties' automated systems do not retain historical data from December 1996.
- There are specific data elements that must be supplied from county systems since MEDS does not retain these elements. We will refer to these data elements as

mandatory, because they are necessary for the calculation of the TANF and CalWORKs time clocks.

- Los Angeles County will be fully converted to LEADER no later than July 15, 2000. LEADER implementation is required for data conversion because mandatory county data elements reside in the LEADER system.
- WCDS' TOA system will be implemented in all WCDS counties no later than June 1, 2000. TOA implementation is required for data conversion because mandatory county data elements reside in the TOA system.
- The ISAWS WTW component will be implemented in all ISAWS counties no later than July 1, 2000. The ISAWS Welfare to Work component implementation is required for data conversion because mandatory county data elements reside in the Welfare to Work system.
- Once converted to the ISAWS WTW and TOA systems respectively, ISAWS and WCDS consortia will maintain the data elements necessary for calculation of the TANF and CalWORKs clocks in a single system. The remaining counties (C-IV, Ventura and Los Angeles counties) may maintain this data in two distinct county systems: The county Welfare Eligibility system and the county Welfare Employment Services system.
- The WDTIP system must be rolled out to all counties no later than July 31, 2000, regardless of the data conversion approach taken.
- Counties/consortia have limited technical and functional resources available for data extraction and data cleanup.
- The WDTIP has finite resources to perform data conversion activities.
- For automated data conversion, standard file formatting is required to ensure that changes made to county systems over time do not impact ongoing updates to the WDTIP database.
- A "big bang" data conversion, whereby all 58 counties' data is converted at once and the system is rolled out, is not feasible, based on the system down-time requirements and the potential for last minute data mishaps that may not be manageable with the current level of WDTIP resources. A phased conversion significantly reduces the risk of poor data quality and missed milestones.
- Several counties do not retain a complete automated history of recipients dating back to December 1996. This data resides in legacy systems, paper files or archived data files. In some cases, this data has been purged. Data is required dating back to December 1996 to meet the data tracking requirements of TANF.
- The Client Index Number (CIN) is the primary key of several tables in SIS. For automated conversion considerations, an interface between the WDTIP system and SCI is imperative since C-IV, Ventura and WCDS counties do not currently maintain CIN numbers in their respective systems.
- Counties must have access to calculated time clock information as early as possible, since time-on-aid limitations must be implemented beginning July 1, 1999. Many recipients may no longer be eligible to receive aid but may continue to receive cash assistance because cumulative statewide time clock data is not yet available.

- Some counties may have specific constraints regarding systems development activities due to county Y2K policies. These specific constraints will be identified through a County Questionnaire that will be completed by all counties no later than September 30, 1999.
- Counties must provide data within the formats prescribed in the **External Developer's Guide**.

5.4 Alternative Analysis

5.4.1 Alternative Analysis Approach

To determine the preferred conversion strategy, the WDTIP Team (State and vendor staff) identified four system conversion strategies available to the Project. The purpose of this alternative analysis is to determine which strategy provides the best approach to county data conversion. The best approach will be the one strategy that best meets the evaluation criteria outlined in this document and adheres to the specific assumptions and constraints regarding data conversion.

The alternative analysis will consist of the following steps:

1. Identification of the criteria for evaluating the conversion strategy alternatives
2. Identification and description of the data conversion strategy alternatives
3. Evaluation of each alternative in relation to other alternatives
4. Selection of the "best" strategy

5.4.2 Criteria for Evaluating Alternatives

In weighing the relative merits of each alternative, our assumptions, constraints and evaluation criteria were considered. The table below explains the criteria used to measure the benefits and drawbacks of each alternative. The importance factor indicates the relative importance placed on the specified criteria, with "1" indicating most important and " 7" indicating least important. For example, it is imperative that the selected conversion strategy promotes complete and accurate data conversion since it will be used to calculate the TANF and CalWORKs clocks. If the quality of data is poor, the new system will be of marginal use to counties, both in the long and short terms. Therefore, the criterion *Data Availability, Completeness and Quality* was given an importance factor of "1." Although the selected conversion strategy should not negatively impact user training or system rollout, this criterion is less important because short-term solutions can be developed to resolve training and rollout issues without jeopardizing the long-term quality or usefulness of the new system. Hence, the criterion, *Compatibility with the Rollout and Training Strategies* was given an importance factor of "7." Note, however, that the importance factor should be used as a general measure of Project priorities and desired outcomes, not as an exact indicator of importance.

Table 5.1: Criteria for Evaluating Data Conversion Alternatives

Criteria	*Description*	*Importance Factor*
Data Availability, Completeness and Quality	The conversion approach should promote conversion of only the best quality data into the WDTIP database. Since the WDTIP system will use the converted data to calculate the CalWORKs and TANF time clocks, it is imperative that the data is complete and in a format acceptable to the WDTIP system. A strategy that allows for the most complete and accurate set of data in the WDTIP database will be considered more favorable than one that does not. The county need for data is urgent, given the immediate need to track the WTW 18/24-month clock. The conversion strategy should promote the earliest availability of accurate time clock data.	1
County Preferences/Buy-in	Because this implementation effort relies heavily upon county activity for its success, county preferences will be highly regarded and county buy-in especially important when considering an approach for the conversion strategy. County preferences have been determined, to some extent, based on JAD session discussion, county polling, and discussions with consortia vendor representatives.	2
Resource Requirements	The conversion alternatives will be evaluated based on the availability of State and county personnel to complete the necessary conversion tasks on schedule and within budget.	3
Complexity	The conversion strategy should represent the least complex method, given the business requirements for conversion and our assumptions and constraints. Complexity is herein defined as the technical or programming complexity of a given strategy. The higher the complexity, the more likely will be the probability of missed milestones and a less than adequate conversion of data. The least complex approach, however, is not necessarily the "best" approach. The complexity of a given strategy must be weighed against the specific benefits it provides and the specific risks it presents.	4
Schedule Constraints and Dependencies	The WDTIP is scheduled for 14 months, commencing June 1, 1999. The conversion approach must work within the time frames of the overall schedule.	5
Coordination with Other Projects and Schedules	The conversion strategy should work in conjunction with other county projects. These projects include, but are not limited to, Y2K, consortia system development and Welfare Reform implementation.	6
Compatibility with the Rollout and Training Strategies	The conversion strategy should not negatively impact the Project's ability to execute training or to rollout the system to end users. A conversion strategy that helps simplify the training or rollout approach will be weighed with more favor than one that does not.	7

5.4.3 County Data Conversion Alternatives

The following four alternatives represent the options that are viable for the one-time conversion of county data and ongoing data updates to the WDTIP database. These alternatives were established through strategy discussions with State and vendor representatives from the WDTIP Team.

Alternative 1 – Convert Data Using a Single Extraction Standard File from Each County. This approach is a *fully* automated method of data conversion. It requires all counties to provide a single standard file containing the county specific data elements required to populate the WDTIP database with historical data dating back to December 1996. A single standard format file would be provided regardless of the number of county systems from which data is extracted. This alternative requires the dedication of both county/consortium and WDTIP technical resources to determine and implement the detailed programming specification, as well as limited county functional resources for data cleanup and testing. Because the individual CIN is required for each record sent from county systems, and because many counties currently cannot retain this data, this alternative would also require the WDTIP system to interface with SCI for the production and matching of county data with statewide WDTIP database data. DHS programming resources would therefore be required to complete the necessary changes to SCI. The WDTIP Team would also need to modify programs in the WDTIP system to accept data from SCI.

The high level tasks associated with this alternative are summarized in the following table:

Table 5.2: Alternative 1 – High Level Tasks

Tasks	*Required Resource*
Develop conversion specifications and document the standard file format	♦ WDTIP Team
Complete programming/produce standard file	♦ County/consortium
Complete programming for data load of county data	♦ WDTIP Team
Complete coding to request CIN number from SCI	♦ WDTIP Team
Complete coding to send CIN number to the WDTIP system	♦ DHS
Test conversion data	♦ WDTIP Team ♦ County/consortium ♦ DHS
Load and test trial data	♦ WDTIP Team ♦ County/consortium
Final load of county data	♦ WDTIP Team ♦ County/consortium

Alternative 2 – Convert Data Using Several Standard Files (i.e., One for Each County System from Which Extraction is Necessary). This approach is also a fully automated method of data conversion. During initial design discussions, some counties expressed that less coding would be required for county technical resources if data could be sent from each county system in which mandatory data resides, without merging the data into a single file. The creation of a single file requires the matching of individuals between two disparate systems, a potentially daunting task for some counties.

This approach would require counties to provide one or more standard files containing all county data elements required to populate the WDTIP database. This alternative requires the dedication of both county/consortia and WDTIP technical resources to determine and implement the detailed programming specification, as well as limited county functional resources for data cleanup and testing. Because the individual CIN is required for each record sent from county systems, and because many counties currently cannot retain this data, this alternative would also require the WDTIP system to interface with SCI for the production and matching of county data with statewide WDTIP database data. DHS programming resources would therefore be required to complete the necessary changes to SCI. The WDTIP would also need to modify programs in the WDTIP system to accept data from SCI.

The high level tasks associated with this alternative are identical to those of Alternative 1. However, for Alternative 1, a single WDTIP database load program would be developed, since all counties would send data in a single standard file. To implement Alternative 2, load programs would potentially need to be developed for each distinct system from which data is received for loading into the WDTIP database. This significantly increases the WDTIP workload, and may jeopardize the Project's ability to complete conversion programs within the Project schedule.

Alternative 3 – Convert Data Manually. This approach provides the least technically complex solution to data conversion. This strategy would require counties to identify all recipients of cash aid since December 1996, and to manually input recipient data into the new system in the post-rollout period. To update data, county staff, through online input into the system, would complete ongoing data updates daily, weekly or monthly. Although this option eliminates programming activities associated with automated conversion, it requires significant functional resources at the county level to implement. Additionally, manual conversion would require considerable time, three to 24 months per county[1], depending on county caseload and resource availability. Hence, the WDTIP database data would be incomplete until all counties complete conversion activities. Finally, this option would require the WDTIP Application Team to build all screens with add/update functionality.

[1] Rough estimates based on data quantity and the experience of other manual conversion efforts (i.e., ISAWS)

The high level tasks associated with this alternative include:

Table 5-3: Alternative 3 – High Level Tasks

Tasks	Required Resource
Specify conversion specifications	♦ WDTIP Team
Communicate required data elements to counties	♦ WDTIP Team
Develop manual conversion procedures	♦ County
Locate data in legacy systems or case folders	♦ County
Manually convert data	♦ County

Alternative 4 – Convert Using a Combination of MEDS, a Single Standard County File and Manual Conversion. This method represents a hybrid approach to data conversion, whereby some data elements would be provided by the counties via a single standard file, some elements would be provided by MEDS, and some elements would be input via online processing. This strategy provides the most flexible approach to data conversion by:

- Allowing counties to send minimal data elements to the WDTIP database (those required for calculation of the time clocks)
- Relying on MEDS to provide non-mandatory data to populate the WDTIP database
- Relying on MEDS to provide historical program participation data for those counties that do not have this data in any automated system
- Allowing counties to manually input information for those mandatory data elements not captured in any county or State system

This alternative would require the same activities as Alternative 1 to produce and process the standard file. In addition, this alternative would require programming resources from WDTIP and DHS to extract and load MEDS data into the WDTIP database. This approach may also require county functional resources to manually convert data not residing in county systems or in MEDS, and to complete regular manual updates of this data.

The high level tasks associated with this alternative include:

Table 5-4: Alternative 4 – High Level Tasks

Tasks	Required Resource
Develop conversion specifications and document the standard file format	♦ WDTIP Team
Complete programming/produce standard file	♦ County/consortium

Tasks	Required Resource
Complete programming for data load of county data	♦ WDTIP Team
Complete coding to request CIN number from SCI	♦ WDTIP Team
Complete coding to send CIN number to the WDTIP system	♦ DHS
Complete coding to send data from MEDS to the WDTIP system	♦ DHS
Complete coding to accept data from MEDS into the WDTIP database	♦ WDTIP Team
Test conversion data	♦ WDTIP Team ♦ County/consortium ♦ DHS
Load and test trial data	♦ WDTIP Team ♦ County/consortium
Final load of county data	♦ WDTIP Team ♦ County/consortium

5.5 Data Conversion Alternative Analysis

5.5.1 Summary of Results

The following section of this document provides the detailed analysis of the four options considered to convert data. The table below summarizes the results of our analysis. In the summary grid, a "▭" indicates that, for the specified criteria, the alternative will be less favorable compared to other alternatives available. A "□"indicates that, for the specified criteria, the alternative would be more favorable than other alternatives available. The best alternative, therefore, is the one that scores better than the other options considered. A *Neutral* rating indicates that the criteria is neither less nor more favorable compared to the other alternatives considered.

Table 5-5: Summary of Alternative Analysis

Criteria	Alternatives			
	1 Single extraction file	2 Several extraction files	3 Manual conversion	4 Combo
1. Data Availability, Completeness and Quality	▭	▭	□	□
2. County Preferences/Buy-in	▭	□	▭	□
3. Resource Requirements	□	▭	▭	□
4. Complexity	□	▭	Neutral	Neutral
5. Schedule Constraints and Dependencies	□	▭	▭	Neutral

Criteria	Alternatives			
	1 Single extraction file	2 Several extraction files	3 Manual conversion	4 Combo
6. Coordination with Other Projects and Schedules	Neutral	Neutral		Neutral
7. Compatibility with the Rollout and Training Strategies	Neutral	Neutral		

5.5.2 Pros and Cons

This section of the conversion strategy presents the benefits (Pros) and drawbacks (Cons) of each of the approaches under consideration. This section represents the content of our analysis, and will determine which approach provides the most efficient and complete solution for data conversion for the WDTIP. The Pros and Cons discussed here directly correlate to the evaluation criteria identified above.

Alternative 1 – Convert data using a single standard file from each county

Pros	Cons
This approach strategy may require less effort for counties/consortia by keeping to a minimum the technical resources required to develop an extraction program.	Most counties retain Diversion, child support reimbursement, Supportive Services Only, and non-California program participation information in manual records. This data is vital for the accurate calculation of time clocks. To avoid poor quality data, this method would need to be coupled with a manual conversion approach, or extraction from multiple systems.
This strategy requires less effort for WDTIP by requiring a single load program to load and update all 58 counties' data.	Thirty-nine counties do not maintain historical data back to December 1996 in their automated systems. This would require counties to extract historical data from archived files or legacy systems, increasing conversion complexity. For some counties, this data has been purged and is no longer available. Hence, this approach may jeopardize data quality and/or necessitate manual conversion activities.
Because of the strategy's relative simplicity, the likelihood of meeting implementation milestones is high.	While providing immediate data at rollout (as opposed to manual conversion), counties may not buy into an approach to data conversion that does not promote the highest possible rate of accuracy.
This strategy would eliminate some programming and maintenance by DHS, since MEDS is not a data source for conversion.	

Alternative 2 – Convert data using several standard files (i.e., one for each county system from which extraction is necessary)

Pros	*Cons*
This approach may result in reduced programming for some counties (as compared to Alternative 1), since those counties that must extract from more than one system would not need to develop a single file format.	This approach *significantly* increases the complexity of conversion and the level of effort for WDTIP technical staff by requiring the development of separate loads for each system from which data would be extracted. The workload for WDTIP programming staff possibly would not be completed in the timeframes dictated by the Project schedule.
This solution would eliminate some programming and maintenance by DHS, since MEDS is not a data source for conversion.	Many counties retain Diversion, child support reimbursement and non-California program participation information in manual records. This data is vital for the accurate calculation of time clocks. To avoid poor quality data, this method would need to be coupled with a manual conversion approach, or counties would need to complete programming to capture these elements in their respective automated systems.
	Thirty-nine counties do not maintain historical data back to December 1996 in their automated systems. This approach would require counties to extract historical data from archived files or legacy systems, increasing conversion complexity. For some counties, this data has been purged and is no longer available. Hence, this approach may jeopardize data quality.
	While providing immediate data at rollout (as opposed to manual conversion), counties may not buy into an approach to data conversion that does not promote the highest possible rate of accuracy.

Alternative 3 – Convert data manually

Pros	*Cons*
This strategy better insures data is reviewed by eligibility staff for accuracy and completeness prior to conversion and ongoing data updates.	This strategy would require significant county resources and time to complete the initial conversion. Ongoing data updates would entail dual data input for each county – input into its welfare system and input into the WDTIP database. It is likely that counties would not have time to perform ongoing updates.
This approach would eliminate the need for county and WDTIP technical resources to complete conversion.	The conversion period would be extensive, rendering the data incomplete and therefore inaccurate until all counties have completed manually converted data.
This strategy provides a method to convert historical and archived information.	Historical and archived data may be difficult for counties to retrieve and make available to conversion workers because data may have been purged or archived. The pulling of individual cases – especially closed cases – would be extremely labor intensive.
	Due to the amount of time conversion will take, this approach may conflict with the implementation efforts of other projects, such as consortia development efforts and EBT activities.
	This approach does not promote county buy-in, since it requires significant county resources over a long period of time and requires duplicate entry.
	This approach does not promote immediate use of the system, since counties would incrementally load data over a considerable amount of time. This approach, therefore, would most likely require refresher training for trainers at a later date.
	This approach requires more staff to be trained in the update functionality, which expands training considerably.
	This approach increases the potential of input errors, which in turn increases the probability of poor quality data, especially in the long term.
	This strategy requires duplicate entry of information into the county's eligibility system and in the new system, considerably increasing the staffs' workload.

Pros	Cons
	This approach would require the WDTIP Application Team to create add/update functionality for the entire set of data. This approach, therefore, would require significant programming effort.

Alternative 4 – Convert using a combination of MEDS, a single standard county file and manual conversion

Pros	Cons
This approach maximizes data quality by providing a method to capture all required data elements and historical data.	This approach requires more DHS technical resources than Alternatives 1 or 2, since it requires an interface with both SCI and with MEDS.
This approach may minimize the data elements counties/consortia must extract from county systems by relying on MEDS for demographic and other non-mandatory data elements.	This approach requires more programming effort for the WDTIP than Alternative 1.
This approach may minimize the county/consortia programming effort by allowing for the conversion of historical information (via MEDS) that may reside in county legacy systems or archived data files.	MEDS historical information will be limited to program and program related information. Exceptions and Exemption data will not be captured, making the clocks less accurate. However, to date, the counties and WDTIP Conversion Team have not identified a more accurate method of capturing historical data.
This approach is the most simple and requires the least amount of effort for county workers by minimizing or eliminating manual conversion.	This approach requires counties to provide a single standard file, regardless of the number of systems from which they must extract data. Most counties/consortia indicated during the JAD session that providing a single file would not be problematic, since the majority of counties retain the required data elements in their respective eligibility systems. A few counties – primarily the C-IV counties – will need to perform specific coding to provide a single file. Although adding to these counties' workload, all of these counties indicated they would be able to provide the single standard file.

Pros	Cons
This approach maximizes flexibility by providing for online input of data that may not reside in county systems. However, to promote data integrity, add/update capability is limited to data elements relating to child support reimbursement, Diversion, non-California program participation and Supportive Services Only.	
This approach promotes county buy-in by minimizing county effort and maximizing the quality of data.	
This approach builds on an already established protocol with MEDS to receive on-going data updates.	
Although MEDS does not have Exception and Exemption information, and therefore cannot provide a complete historical data set, it will still provide the best quality historical information, since most counties who will use it are unable to provide any information at all (including program data).	
This approach reduces county effort by eliminating the need to extract data – either manually or electronically – from hard copy files, legacy systems or archived files – to acquire data back to December 1996. Instead, this data can be extracted from Pre-SAWS SIS.	
This approach minimizes the online add/update/delete functionality that the WDTIP must develop, thereby minimizing the number of programming resources required for the effort.	

5.6 Selected Data Conversion Strategy

Alternative 4

Convert Using a Combination of MEDS, a Single Standard County File and Manual Conversion

Based on our analysis, the best strategy for conversion of county data is Alternative 4: *Convert Using a Combination of MEDS, a Single Standard County File and Manual Conversion*. This alternative maximizes the use of automation tools while minimizing county/consortia required resources (both technical and functional). It provides the greatest amount of flexibility to account for various county specific data issues (i.e.,

manual input of elements not retained in county systems). This approach minimizes the number of data elements counties must extract from their respective systems by leveraging the pre-existing MEDS interface to capture data not required to calculate time clocks (i.e., date of birth information). This strategy best balances the need for the best quality data and the effort of work required from counties/consortia, WDTIP and DHS, and provides the maximum amount of flexibility for the one-time conversion of data and for ongoing data updates.

5.7 Strategy Detail

During the JAD session, representatives from each of the eight county Welfare systems met to determine the design of the WDTIP conversion. This workgroup started from the basic premise that counties would have available to them their own county systems, MEDS, and online updates as tools for populating the WDTIP database. The following summarizes the overall conversion strategy defined during the JAD session.

5.7.1 Initial and Ongoing Load Strategy

Currently, SIS is populated with MEDS and MEDS derived data dating back to August 1996. The conversion strategy leverages this data history for those counties unable to provide historical data back to the start of the TANF time clock (i.e., December 1996). The strategy for the initial and ongoing load of the WDTIP database data includes the following components:

- Load all mandatory data elements necessary to calculate TANF and CalWORKs time clocks directly from county systems using a single standard file format.
- Load mandatory data not residing in the counties' systems via online input after rollout. This data includes Diversion, Supportive Services Only, non-California program participation and child support reimbursement information. County workers will input this data on a daily, weekly or monthly basis.
- Load all data elements not necessary for the calculation of the TANF and CalWORKs time clocks from MEDS.
- For counties unable to provide data from December 1996, populate the WDTIP database with county data from the earliest date possible and use Pre-SAWS SIS data for history prior to the county's earliest possible date (this applies to the initial conversion only). While this approach does not factor Exemptions and Exceptions into this historical data derived from MEDS, it provides the best possible approach given the status of this data in the counties. At the JAD session, most counties agreed that if a county does not have a way to convert this data electronically, the only way it can be converted is from MEDS because it no longer, or never has been, recorded at the county level.

Due to the large amount of data being converted, conversion will be phased over a one- to two-month period of time, ending no later than July 31, 2000. The county schedule for data conversion will be determined based on the preparedness of each county/consortium to provide data. It is anticipated that the rollout will be phased by consortium for ISAWS and WCDS and by county for all other counties (Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Ventura,

Riverside, Merced and Stanislaus). However, the exact conversion schedule will be determined during the development phase of the Project.

5.7.2 Conversion Activities and Milestones

JAD participants and the WDTIP Conversion Team identified the following key milestone activities and dates. It is imperative that the Project adhere to these milestones to ensure the timely implementation of the new system. These milestones are:

Table 5-6: Conversion Activities and Milestones

Milestone	*Description*	*Time Frame*
Review Sample County Data	The WDTIP Conversion Team will request a sample file of the county mandatory data elements from all counties as well as a copy of their data dictionary. There will be no specific format in which this data should be sent. County data will be reviewed by the WDTIP Conversion Team to ensure the data is consistent and meets the requirements of the TRAC (Tracking Recipients Across California) application.	9/10/99
Distribute External Developer's Guide to Counties	The WDTP Conversion Team will develop and distribute to counties/consortia the ***External Developer's Guide*** which will provide the detail required to code county extraction programs and develop the county standard file.	9/30/99
Develop Extract Programs	Using the ***External Developer's Guide***, counties will develop the necessary programs to extract data from their county systems and develop the standard county file. In addition, the WDTIP Conversion Team will develop an extraction file to migrate SIS data into the WDTIP database using a standard file format.	10/1/99 through 12/31/99
Modify Existing Ongoing MEDS Extract Programs	Using the conversion design specifications, DHS will develop the extracts necessary to send MEDS data to the WDTIP system.	10/1/99 through 12/31/99
Develop Data Load Programs	Using the conversion design specifications, the WDTIP Conversion Team will develop the programs to load data from the standard county data files and from MEDS.	10/1/99 through 12/31/99

Milestone	Description	Time Frame
Test Sample County Extraction Data	Once the counties have completed development of the standard county file, the WDTIP Conversion Team will request the county send a sample set of data using the standard file format. The Conversion Team will run this data through edit programs, initiate appropriate clean up activities or inform the county of any required cleanup. The county may send several iterations of test files for review during this time period.	1/01/00 through 3/31/00
Trial Load Full Extraction Files	Once the county's data has been tested using a sample of data, the Conversion Team will request that the county send a full extract of data for testing. This data will be loaded into a user testing environment for county and WDTIP review in a production-like environment.	4/1/00 through 5/25/00
Complete County Initial Loads	Users will be provided access to the new screens and functionality. County data will be converted from the end of May through July 2000.	5/25/00 through 7/31/00

The specifics of the detailed design of conversion, as well as the conversion schedule will be included in the conversion plan, which will be submitted in January 2000. Conversion activities will also include the tracking of county progress. Specific tasks associated with this activity will be discussed in the **Implementation Plan**.

6. System Rollout Strategy

6.1 Objective

The objective of the rollout strategy analysis is to identify and examine various options for rolling out the new system to each of the 58 California counties, and to select the strategy that best suits the needs of the State and counties, given specific preferences and constraints.

6.2 Introduction and Definition

While the conversion strategy defines how the WDTIP database will be populated with county data, the rollout strategy defines when users will be given access to the new screens and new system functionality. Rollout is also referred to as system "go live," and can be accomplished in two distinct ways:

- **A "big bang" rollout**: With this method, the WDTIP Team will simultaneously provide all counties access to the new screens and functionality
- **A phased rollout**: With this method, the WDTIP Team will provide counties access to the new screens and functionality by county or by a group of counties, followed by another county or group of counties, and so on, until the rollout is complete

As per the selected conversion strategy, our analysis of these two approaches has been executed with the assumption of a phased conversion. The question, therefore, is whether rollout is phased along with conversion, or if the system should be made available as soon as the first group of counties converts.

6.3 Assumptions and Constraints

For the purpose of this analysis, we have made specific assumptions and identified constraints that pertain to the rollout strategy:

6.3.1 Assumptions

- Based on their respective schedules, SFIS and EBT neither impact nor are impacted by the WDTIP rollout, since significant activities for these projects are not scheduled until after July 2000. However, it is assumed that the WDTIP will need to coordinate with these projects to ensure that various kick-off activities for these projects do not conflict with WDTIP activities.
- The SIS database is already populated with MEDS program data, dating back to August 1996.
- State resources will be assigned to assist with rollout activities. These activities include developing the rollout plan, and working with external agencies and counties to promote buy in.
- County trainers may train staff in the production environment after the county goes live, or train their users in the WDTIP training environment.

- The WDTIP training environment will be ready to use by April 15, 2000.

6.3.2 Constraints

- The conversion strategy dictates that data elements necessary to meet the new system's business requirements will be converted partially from county systems via a single standard file, partially from MEDS, and partially from county online input (for data relating to non-California program participation, child support reimbursement, Diversion and Supportive Services Only).
- A "big bang" conversion, whereby all 58 counties' data is converted at once and the system is rolled out, is not feasible, based on the system down-time requirements and the potential for last minute data mishaps that may not be manageable with the current level of WDTIP resources.
- To ensure counties are prepared to use the new system, county trainers must be trained on the new system prior to rollout.
- The rollout schedule must work in conjunction with other implementation schedules including, but not limited to, State and county Y2K preparation, county Welfare Reform implementation, welfare consortia systems development/implementation, and other county systems development projects. The WDTIP Implementation Questionnaire was sent to counties in August 1999 to assess the specific constraints facing counties during the WDTIP implementation period. We assume for this analysis that no major scheduling conflicts currently exist, and that we will need to coordinate with counties to best meet their specific constraints.
- Per the WDTIP schedule, rollout including all converted county data, will be completed no later than July 31, 2000.

6.4 Alternative Analysis

6.4.1 Alternative Analysis Approach

To determine the preferred rollout strategy, WDTIP Team members identified two rollout approaches appropriate to the Project. The purpose of this alternative analysis is to determine which strategy provides the best approach to system rollout. The best approach will be the one strategy that best meets the evaluation criteria outlined in the following section.

The alternative analysis methodology consists of the following steps:

1. Identification of the criteria for evaluating the rollout strategy alternatives
2. Identification and description of the system rollout strategy alternatives
3. Evaluation of each alternative in relation to others alternatives
4. Selection of the "best" strategy

6.4.2 Criteria for Evaluating Alternatives

The following table provides the criteria used to measure the respective merits of each system rollout alternative. These criteria reflect the Project's objective to provide a

quality approach, given specific constraints. The importance factor indicates the relative importance placed on the specified criteria, with "1" indicating most important, and "5" indicating least important. For example, it is imperative that the selected rollout strategy be the least complex, both functionally and technically, to implement. Hence, the criterion, *Ease of Implementation,* was given an importance factor of "1." Similarly, although the rollout strategy should not conflict with other county implementation projects, this criterion is less important because short term solutions can be developed to work around scheduling constraints without jeopardizing the long term quality or usefulness of the new system. Hence, the criterion, *Coordination with Other Projects and Schedules,* was given an importance factor of "5." Note, however, that the importance factor should be used as a general and comparative measure of Project priorities and desired outcomes, not as an exact indicator of importance.

Table 6-1: Criteria for Evaluating the System Rollout Strategy Alternatives

Criteria	*Description*	*Importance Factor*
Ease of Implementation	The rollout strategy should represent the least complex functional and technical method, given the requirements of implementation and our assumptions and constraints. The least complex approach, however, is not necessarily the "best" approach. The complexity of a given strategy must be weighed against the specific benefits it provides. Complexity increases the risk of not meeting Project deadlines and can threaten a timely implementation of the new system.	1
Resource Requirements	The rollout alternatives will be evaluated based on the availability of WDTIP, DHS and county personnel to complete the necessary tasks in a timely fashion. A rollout strategy that minimizes resource requirements while maintaining quality will be favored over one that does not.	2
County Preferences/Buy-in	Because this implementation effort relies heavily on county activity for its success, county preferences will be highly regarded and county buy-in especially important when considering an approach for system rollout. County preferences have been determined, to some extent, based on JAD session discussion, county polling and discussions with consortia representatives. The WDTIP Implementation Questionnaire was sent to counties in August 1999 to assess the counties' preferences and constraints during the WDTIP implementation period. This questionnaire is due back in September 1999, and the results will be considered as the rollout plan is developed.	3
Compatibility with the Training and Change Leadership Strategies	The rollout strategy must not negatively impact the Project's ability to execute training or change leadership activities. If possible, the strategy should simplify the approach to training and change leadership.	4

Criteria	*Description*	*Importance Factor*
Coordination with Other Projects and Schedules	The rollout strategy must work in conjunction with the constraints of other county information technology projects. These projects include, but are not limited to, Y2K, consortia system development and Welfare Reform implementation. The strategy that provides the most flexibility to work around county commitments to these other projects will be favored over one that does not.	5

6.4.3 System Rollout Alternatives

Alternative 1 – Rollout Counties Concurrently (i.e., Big Bang) with a Phased Conversion. For this alternative, all counties would have access to the new system at the same time, and begin using the new screens and functionality simultaneously. Presumably, the system would be made available when the first county or group of counties convert their data. Although rollout would be big bang, conversion would be phased over a one- to two-month period of time and would end no later than July 31, 2000. Most counties, therefore, would rollout prior to the conversion of their data. In the interim period between system rollout and the completion of all 58 counties' data conversion, the WDTIP database would be populated with a combination of county specific data (from those counties that have converted data), and Pre-SAWS SIS data. Converting Pre-SAWS SIS data into the WDTIP database is necessary to ensure that no functionality is lost during the rollout period.

All trainers would need to be trained in advance of rollout, and be afforded sufficient time to plan and execute in-county training and identify county specific business process changes.

Alternative 2 – Phase the Rollout by County or Consortia, with a Corresponding Phased Conversion. For this alternative, the system would be rolled-out incrementally, with counties going live concurrently with their respective data conversions. As with Alternative 1, the conversion would be phased over a one-to two-month period of time. In the interim period between system rollout and the completion of all 58 counties' data conversion, the WDTIP database would be populated with a combination of county specific data (from those counties that have converted data), and Pre-SAWS SIS data (from those counties that have not yet converted).

To implement this approach, dual system maintenance would be required to ensure that those counties that have not yet converted to the WDTIP database have access to statewide tracking information. These two systems would be:

- The WDTIP database and the new WDTIP system, which would be accessed by counties that have converted to the new system
- The Pre-SAWS SIS database and Pre-SAWS system, which would be accessed by those counties that have not yet converted to the new system

At a minimum, dual system maintenance would require:

- Concurrent batch updates to Pre-SAWS SIS and the WDTIP database during the rollout. This could have a significant impact on maintenance costs, since transaction processing would be doubled
- Enhanced security maintenance for DHS (DHS must maintain both Pre-SAWS and WDTIP security, and coordinate security as a county goes live to eliminate access to Pre-SAWS while granting access to WDTIP)
- Maintenance of two distinct interfaces with the WDTIP system for individual matching
- Maintenance of two distinct CICS regions

In lieu of maintaining two database environments, the WDTIP could potentially eliminate access to Pre-SAWS once the first counties converted to the new system. However, this approach would render some counties without access to any SIS data during the one- to two-month phased rollout. It is assumed, then, that the elimination of Pre-SAWS would not be a viable option for the Project.

6.5 System Rollout Alternative Analysis

6.5.1 Summary of Results

The following section of this document provides the detailed analysis of the two options considered to rollout the new system convert data. The table below summarizes the results of our analysis. In the summary grid, a "▭" indicates that, for the specified criteria, the alternative would be less favorable compared to other alternatives available. A "□"indicates that, for the specified criteria, the alternative would be more favorable than other alternatives available. The best alternative, therefore, is the one that is relatively better than the other options considered. A "Neutral" rating indicates that the criteria is neither less nor more favorable compared to the other alternatives considered.

Table 6-2: Summary of Alternative Analysis

Criteria	*Alternatives*	
	***1** Concurrent roll out*	***2** Phased rollout*
1. Complexity	□	▭
2. Resource Requirements	□	▭
3. County Preference/Buy-in	Neutral	□
4. Coordination with County Projects and Schedules	▭	□

Criteria	*Alternatives*	
	***1** Concurrent roll out*	***2** Phased rollout*
5. Compatibility with Training and Change Leadership Strategies	Neutral	

6.5.2 Pros and Cons

This section of the rollout strategy document presents the benefits (Pros) and drawbacks (Cons) of each of the approaches under consideration. This section represents the content of our analysis, and will determine which approach provides the most efficient and complete solution to system rollout for the WDTIP. The Pros and Cons discussed here directly correlate to the evaluation criteria identified above.

Alternative 1 – Rollout counties concurrently (i.e., big bang).

Pros	*Cons*
This approach minimizes the technical complexity and, in turn, the required WDTIP technical resources of rollout by limiting maintenance to a single system.	This approach could intensify the immediate short-term need for WDTIP resources during the conversion and rollout period because the demand for rollout support would be immediate for all 58 counties. For example, Help Desk calls would increase dramatically in the first couple weeks of rollout, requiring WDTIP resources to handle county questions. However, given the relative simplicity of the new system (and that counties are already familiar with Pre-SAWS) we do not anticipate the increased demand for support to exceed the ability of WDTIP resources.
Although potentially increasing the demand for WDTIP resources at rollout, the demand for support services could be mitigated via pre-rollout planning and the development of user materials.	This approach does not allow for the timing of training in accordance with a county's rollout and conversion dates. We estimate that it will require approximately six weeks to train all 58 counties' trainers. Some counties would be trained six weeks prior to system rollout, which may necessitate some degree of "refresher training" at rollout. However, larger counties that will train staff prior to rollout and in a training environment may, in fact, require six weeks to prepare for training and to train staff. Hence, this approach could allow the WDTIP to train larger counties earlier and smaller counties that may train in production just prior to rollout.

Alternative 2 – Phase the rollout by county or consortia

Pros	*Cons*
This approach may promote county buy-in by providing a larger degree of flexibility by allowing counties to rollout on the system when their data is converted. Each county could coordinate a conversion/rollout date that best suits the county, and be trained based on their rollout date.	This approach increases the technical complexity and, in turn, the required WDTIP and DHS technical resources by requiring dual system maintenance. This approach would require careful coordination with DHS to roll counties off Pre-SAWS and onto WDTIP during rollout/conversion. The effort involved to implement this approach may not be worth the benefits realized. The rollout is only one to two months long, which may not justify the increased maintenance cost associated with dual system processing.
This approach would result in a phased demand for WDTIP rollout support resources instead of a one-time demand for resources. However, the minimization of functional resources would be more than offset by the increase in technical resources to maintain two systems.	If two systems are not maintained, this approach may render some counties without access to a statewide tool to determine the TANF and CalWORKs time clocks during the phased rollout.
This approach allows for training of county trainers just prior to the county's rollout date, which may maximize user understanding of the system by providing "just in time" training.	

6.6 Selected Rollout Strategy

Alternative 1
Rollout Counties Concurrently (Big Bang)

Based on our analysis, the best approach to rolling out the new system is Alternative 1: *Rollout Counties Concurrently (Big Bang)*. This approach is the best strategy because it minimizes the potential complexity of the rollout by requiring the maintenance of a single technical environment during implementation. Although it does not specifically lend itself to "just in time" training, or coordination with county specific scheduling constraints, it does not negatively impact these areas. County trainers may be trained beginning six weeks prior to system rollout and, in the pre-rollout period, have access to a training environment to develop their county training plans, access to system and user materials, and access to the WDTIP Help Desk. Moreover, because system rollout does not pose a particularly high risk for counties (since the system is primarily used for data inquiry only and not for benefit determination), should the rollout date coincide with

other county projects of higher priority, the county would have the flexibility to train users and begin using the new functionality at the county's convenience.

6.7 Strategy Detail

The specific details that dictated how the system is rolled out will be incorporated into the rollout plan, due for submission in January 2000.

7. Training Strategy

7.1 Objective

The objective of the training strategy analysis is to identify and examine the various options available to the WDTIP to train county trainers on the new system functionality, to determine the best approach, and to provide specific details around the selected training approach. The goal of the analysis is to select the strategy that best suits the training needs of the counties, given specific assumptions and constraints.

7.2 Introduction and Definition

The WDTIP training program will be designed and delivered with the primary objective of making county staff proficient in the use of the new system, and to provide them the capability to perform their assigned duties using the new functionality. The WDTIP Implementation Team will develop the WDTIP training curriculum to train county trainers. In turn, county trainers will train county staff, or end users. Depending on county trainer needs, the WDTIP Implementation Team may include adult learning principles and hands-on practice in conducting the training.

Training the trainers can be accomplished in three ways:

- **Training at each county**: With this method, the WDTIP Implementation Team travels to each county to train the county trainers.
- **Regional training**: With this method, county trainers travel to regional training sites throughout California for training. Regions may be divided geographically or by regions within each consortium. Both options are considered in this analysis.
- **Centralized training**: With this method county trainers travel to Sacramento for training.

This analysis will identify the most appropriate approach to training the trainers. Each of the alternative strategies discussed is either a county, regional, centralized or a hybrid approach to training the trainers.

The WDTIP Implementation Questionnaire was sent to counties in August 1999 to assess the counties' training preference and needs. The questionnaire will help us determine the training content, the best delivery approach, and the technical and networking requirements for conducting training, and will facilitate the development of a training program that provides county staff the appropriate content and context.

7.3 Assumptions and Constraints

For the purpose of this analysis, we have made specific assumptions and identified constraints that pertain to the training strategy. These include:

7.3.1 Assumptions

- State resources will be assigned to assist with training activities.
- The WDTIP Team will utilize the train-the-trainer approach.
- Training will be conducted at existing State or county training facilities.
- Deloitte Consulting will not be responsible for providing any training equipment.
- Each county will assign at least one trainer to the train-the-trainer course.
- Counties will send an average of four trainers per county.
- Train-the-trainer training for the WDTIP system will require approximately six to eight hours for a class of ten county trainers, with two WDTIP trainers per classroom.
- County trainers will need to be trained to use online inquiry, or the add/update/delete functionality.
- Appropriate county staff will need to be trained to read reports.
- Train-the-trainer training will be conducted using a training region.
- County trainers will have the option of training county staff in the post rollout production environment or in the training region.
- The WDTIP training environment will be ready to use by April 15, 2000.
- DHS will provide the WDTIP with an SCI training region for the purpose of end-user training.
- The county and consortia attendees at the JAD session provided accurate information regarding the training preferences of the counties.
- Per the SFIS Project schedule, SFIS activities will not coincide with the WDTIP 14-month implementation schedule.
- Per the EBT Project schedule, EBT activities will not impact WDTIP training activities, since design activities for that project do not begin until 2001.

7.3.2 Constraints

- Training sessions must occur prior to the system rollout date.
- The WDTIP system will be rolled out to all counties concurrently (big bang) and will contain all county converted data no later than July 31, 2000.
- The WDTIP has finite resources to perform training activities and to travel off-site to conduct training.
- The conversion strategy dictates an automated conversion, requiring data extraction from county systems and MEDS, with some manual input required for Diversion, non-California program participation, Supportive Services Only, and child support reimbursement.
- The WDTIP Implementation Team will provide guidance and support. Each county, however, will be responsible for end user training in their respective counties.

7.4 Alternative Analysis

7.4.1 Alternative Analysis Approach

To determine the preferred training strategy, the WDTIP Team identified five different approaches that would be feasible for the WDTIP. The purpose of this alternative analysis is to determine which approach provides the most appropriate approach to training the counties' trainers. The selected approach will be the one strategy that is the most appropriate, given the evaluation criteria outlined in the section below.

The alternative analysis methodology consists of the following steps:

1. Identification of the criteria for evaluating the training strategy alternatives
2. Identification and description of the training strategy alternatives
3. Evaluation of each alternative in relation to the other alternatives
4. Selection of the most appropriate strategy

7.4.2 Criteria for Evaluating Training Alternatives

The following table provides the criteria used to measure the respective merits of each training alternative. These criteria reflect the Project's objective of providing a quality approach, given specific constraints. The importance factor indicates the relative importance placed on the specified criteria, with "1" indicating most important and "7" indicating least important. For example, it is very important that the selected training strategy promote the ongoing use of the new system in each county. If training cannot sufficiently provide counties with the information they need to use the new system in each county's specific environment, the system will be of limited use to the county. Hence, the criterion, *Training Results,* was given an importance factor of "1." Similarly, the selected training strategy should facilitate change leadership and system rollout activities. However, because change leadership and system rollout activities can be implemented independently from training (though this is not preferred), the relative import of this criterion is less. Hence, the criterion, *Coordination with Other Projects and Schedules,* was given an importance factor of "7." The importance factor should be used as a general measure of Project priorities and desired outcomes, not as an exact indicator of importance.

Table 7-1: Criteria for Evaluating the Training Strategy Alternatives

Criteria	Description	Importance Factor
Training Results	Each of the potential strategies will be evaluated based on the projected quality of the training results. A strategy will produce quality results by providing the best quality system knowledge to trainers and end users, and promote the use of the new system and new business processes. Training should promote immediate use of the new system.	1
County Travel Requirements	Not only are there costs associated with county travel, but travel also takes county workers away from county work and can place significant burden upon counties. Therefore, the strategy will be evaluated based on the level of travel resources required for counties. A strategy that minimizes travel while providing training results will be rated higher than one requiring more travel.	2
County Preferences and Buy-in	Because this implementation effort relies heavily on county activity for its success, county preferences will be highly regarded and county buy-in especially important when considering an approach for the training strategy. County preferences have been determined, to some extent, based on JAD session discussions.	3
WDTIP Resource	Because WDTIP training resources are limited, the training alternatives will be evaluated based on the availability and number of WDTIP resources required to complete the necessary tasks for train-the-trainer sessions.	4
Ease of Implementation	The training strategy must represent the least complex method for delivering training to county trainers. It must also provide the least amount of effort on the part of the county and State staff to locate appropriate facilities and geographic location.	5
Schedule	Each alternative differs in the amount of time spent to deliver train-the-trainer training. The selected strategy should be aligned with the Project schedule and allow counties adequate amount of time to train their staff after train-the-trainer sessions.	6
Coordination with Other Projects and Schedules	The training strategy must work in conjunction with the constraints of other county information technology projects. These projects include, but are not limited to, Y2K, consortia system development, and Welfare Reform implementation. The strategy that provides the most flexibility to work around county commitments to these other projects will be favored over one that does not.	7

7.4.3 Training Alternatives

The following five alternatives represent the viable options for conducting train-the-trainer sessions. All five alternatives assume that training will take place prior to system

rollout. These alternatives were established through strategy discussions with State and vendor representatives from the WDTIP Implementation Team.

Alternative 1 –Train-the-trainers by County. For this approach, the WDTIP Implementation Team would travel to each county to train each county's trainer(s). Counties' designated trainers would be trained in the respective county's offices. This alternative would require 15 weeks to complete, based on the Implementation Team spending one day at each county and visiting four counties per week.

Alternative 2 –Train-the-trainers by Consortium. For this approach, the WDTIP Implementation Team would provide train-the-trainer sessions to counties by consortia. There would be a total of four training sites, one per consortium. Each consortium would host training for its counties. Counties' designated trainers would travel to each consortium's training site for the train-the-trainer sessions. This approach would require six weeks to complete, based on a four days per week training schedule.

Alternative 3 –Train-the-trainers by Geographic Region. For this approach, the WDTIP Implementation Team would divide the State into six regions. Each county, therefore, would be included in one of these regions and designated trainers from each county would travel to the regional training site for the train-the-trainer sessions. This approach would require six weeks to complete, based on a four-days-per-week training schedule. The WDTIP Implementation Team would spend approximately one week at each regional site, utilizing approximately six training sites throughout California.

Alternative 4 –Train-the-trainers at a Centralized Location. For this approach, the WDTIP Implementation Team would conduct train-the-trainer sessions in Sacramento. County trainers would travel to the centralized location for training. Classes would be offered over five weeks, and the WDTIP would offer five training sessions per week. Counties' designated trainers would attend the day when it is most convenient. Classes may have counties from all four consortia and from various geographic regions.

Alternative 5 –Train-the-trainers Using a Combination of the Approaches. This approach allows counties more flexibility in how they receive training. The WDTIP Implementation Team would conduct train-the-trainer sessions at five to seven regional sites, and could offer several centralized (i.e., Sacramento based) training for those counties or consortia representatives able to travel to Sacramento. Regional locations could be determined based on the location of consortia counties. For example, one or more regional training sessions could be held in Redding, specifically for ISAWS counties since most of the northern counties are ISAWS counties. In this instance, counties in each consortium would be grouped by regions within the consortium.

The WDTIP Implementation Team could couple this consortium regional training approach with at least two additional approaches to allow extra flexibility. These include,

1. County specific training for those counties with special circumstances that warrant site visits by the WDTIP Team. These county visits would need to be limited due to

WDTIP resource constraints, which would require the Project to identify the circumstances that would warrant in-county training.

2. Regional training sessions that are not consortium specific.

We anticipate that this approach would require approximately six weeks, four days per week, to complete.

7.5 Training Alternative Analysis

7.5.1 Summary of Results

The following section of this document provides the detailed analysis of the five options considered to train the trainers. The table below summarizes the results of our analysis. In the summary grid, a "▭" indicates that, for the specified criteria, the alternative will be less favorable compared to other alternatives available. A "□"indicates that, for the specified criteria, the alternative would be more favorable than other alternatives available. The best alternative, therefore, is the one that is relatively better than the other options considered. A "Neutral" rating indicates that the criteria is neither less nor more favorable compared to the other alternatives considered.

Table 7-2: Summary of Alternative Analysis

Criteria	*Alternatives*				
	1 Train by County	*2 Train by Consortium*	*3 Train by Geographic Region*	*4 Train at Centralized Site*	*5 Combo*
1. Training Results	□	Neutral	▭	▭	□
2. County Travel Requirements	□	Neutral	▭	▭	□
3. County Preferences and Buy-in	□	□	Neutral	▭	□
4. Resource Requirements	▭	Neutral	Neutral	□	Neutral
5. Ease of Implementation	▭	Neutral	Neutral	□	Neutral
6. Schedule	▭	Neutral	Neutral	□	Neutral
7. Coordination with Other Projects and Schedules	□	□	▭	▭	□

7.5.2 Pros and Cons

This section of the training strategy presents the benefits (Pros) and drawbacks (Cons) of each of the approaches under consideration. This section represents the content of our analysis, and will determine which strategy provides the most efficient and complete

solution to train-the-trainer training for the WDTIP. The Pros and Cons discussed here directly correlate to the evaluation criteria identified above.

Alternative 1: Train-the-trainers by County

Pros	*Cons*
Because this approach offers county training that specifically addresses a county's business process and allows for customized training, this approach would promote county buy-in and allow for better coordination with other projects and schedules.	Training the trainers by visiting each county poses high resource requirements by requiring a minimum of 15 weeks to complete. Because of the low complexity of the new system functionality, the few benefits derived do not justify the high resource requirements to execute the approach.
Conducting training sessions using this method would be easy for the counties to implement. The county staff would be trained in their own facility and need not travel to attend training, hence promoting county buy in.	Per the current WDTIP schedule, a training region would not be available until April 15, 2000. This would not allow sufficient time to train all counties prior to rollout in a training region.
The WDTIP Implementation Team would be able to accommodate more of a specific county's staff in the training session as compared with other alternatives. Counties could conceivably allow up to 10 staff to receive training. The training sessions would allow more time for the WDTIP Team and county staff to discuss changes in business processes and implement changes relevant to the specific county.	Because county trainers and end users who receive training during the earlier weeks may not retain their WDTIP system knowledge for go-live, they may need refresher courses.
	This approach would require significant coordination of county preferences, WDTIP training resources as well as coordination with the schedule of other counties.

Alternative 2: Train-the-trainers by Consortium

Pros	*Cons*
Based on JAD session discussions, counties in the same consortium are more likely to have similar processes, especially for ISAWS. By grouping them together, the WDTIP Team would be able to discuss processes that are common within each consortium, thereby enhancing the effectiveness of training for each county.	There would only be a maximum of four training sites under this alternative, one per consortium. This may add to travel time for counties designated trainers.
Minimizes travel for the WDTIP Implementation Team and allows training to be completed in a shorter amount of time, relative to other alternatives, and allows the counties to have more time to train their staff after train-the-trainer sessions.	This alternative does not allow flexibility to meet county specific scheduling restraints. All counties would need to be trained within the timeframes assigned to their consortium's training schedule.
Counties within a consortium face the same schedules for other projects within that consortium. This alternative allows for more flexibility to accommodate other activities.	Those counties requiring special attention may lose the benefit of having county-level focus on business processes, because they are either grouped into training with other consortium counties that may not have similar business processes.
	C-IV counties as well as Ventura County may not have similar processes, as they are not using the same eligibility system.
	Consortia counties are not necessarily geographically close to each other. This approach may require extensive travel for some counties, such as Modoc or Imperial.

Alternative 3: Train-the-trainers by Geographic Region

Pros	*Cons*
This approach is relatively more convenient for county trainers than Alternatives 2 or 4 because it requires the least amount of travel.	This approach does not promote the customization of change leadership activities by consortium system or by county. Business process changes would be discussed generically during training, and counties would be responsible for applying generic concepts to their specific county.
This approach can be implemented based on past experiences with other projects. For example, specific regions and training facilities have already been identified by the EBT and	This approach requires relatively more planning to locate appropriate facilities to accommodate trainers, as well as coordinating schedules for counties' rollout date.

Pros	Cons
SAWS-TA projects.	
This approach is more accommodating of each county's schedule because each county would have several choices for location and schedule of training.	This approach does not promote the level of user buy in as Alternatives 1 or 5, which provide county specific attention and/or enhanced flexibility to accommodate county scheduling restraints.

Alternative 4: Train-the-trainers at a Centralized Location

Pros	*Cons*
The WDTIP Implementation Team would be able to train at existing State training facilities and is able to offer five classes each week. These facilities which may include for example, the HHSDC Training Site or the ISAWS Training Site, would provide access to the training region for a large number of users.	With a centralized location, county designated trainers may need to travel slightly more than expected to receive training. This does not necessarily increase the time away from the county, but will increase travel costs for some counties.
Because of the availability of several facilities in Sacramento, the WDTIP could hold concurrent classes, which would accelerate training. Relative to the other alternatives, this method would be the easiest for the WDTIP Implementation Team to deliver the training to counties, since State facilities are already connected to the MEDS training region and no travel would be required.	This alternative may not promote the highest level of county buy-in, since it requires travel cost and time which might otherwise be avoided with other approaches.
	This approach does not promote the customization of change leadership activities by consortium system or by county. Business process changes would be discussed generically during training and counties would be responsible for applying generic concepts to their specific county.

Alternative 5: Train-the-trainers Using a Combination of the Approaches

Pros	*Cons*
This alternative is the most flexible approach, allowing for the incorporation of county preferences and constraints when determining the training sites and schedule.	This alternative requires more effort by the WDTIP Implementation Team to identify and to develop ways to accommodate county preferences. This approach may establish county expectation that the WDTIP Implementation Team can accommodate the approach that best suits the county. Given limited WDTIP resources, constraints would need to be placed on county requests.

Pros	Cons
This alternative could potentially accommodate those counties that may require special attention due to the number of staff impacted by the new system and the extent of business process changes.	This alternative still requires county trainers to travel to a training site. However, it is slightly better than Alternatives 2 and 3 because some counties may not need to travel, as the WDTIP Implementation Team may plan some site visits to counties.
This option also contributes to county buy-in because it considers the specific needs of each county, and attempts to accommodate county scheduling constraints.	
Though resource commitment must be carefully monitored to ensure the WDTIP Team can manage the training workload, this strategy could provide considerably more flexibility in exchange for a marginal increase in WDTIP resources to plan and execute training.	

7.6 Selected Training Strategy

Alternative 5

Train-the-trainers Using a Combination of the Approaches

Based on our analysis, the most appropriate strategy for training the county trainers is Alternative 5: *Train-the-trainers Using a Combination of the Approaches*. This strategy balances the need for training results and the effort of resources required from the WDTIP Implementation Team and counties. Training using a combination of approaches provides the maximum amount of flexibility because it considers the needs of each county, in exchange for a marginal increase in WDTIP resources to plan and execute training.

This strategy allows the WDTIP Implementation Team to accommodate those counties that may require special attention due to the number of staff impacted by the new system and the extent of business process changes. While Alternative 1 also allows the WDTIP Implementation Team to accommodate county-specific needs, it would require considerable time and effort to implement. Based on the strategy of rollout with the big bang approach, county trainers who were trained during the first week of training would not be given access to the new system for up to 15 weeks. Because the training region will not be developed until mid April, some counties would need be trained in the post-rollout period, which does not promote immediate use of the system, and leaves counties that have not been trained with no access to statewide data. Thus, Alternative 1 is not an effective approach for training.

Although Alternative 2 promotes training results by grouping counties with similar business processes in one class, it does not provide the flexibility to accommodate counties that require special attention. Because larger counties may require more time to train their end users, they may need to begin training earlier than smaller counties. Alternative 2 may not provide the flexibility to do this, since counties in the same consortium would be scheduled to train together, depending on size and specific need. While Alternative 2 accommodates some business process discussions at the consortium level, Alternative 5 provides more flexibility to accommodate those counties that require special attention in addition to consortium level business process discussions.

Relative to Alternative 5, Alternative 3 is less accommodating for maximizing training results. Alternative 3 allows each county several choices for locations and scheduling of training. However, Alternative 5 is the most flexible approach, allowing the training to take place within consortium or for individual counties. Grouping counties by geographic region only would render it more difficult to promote the customization of change leadership activities. Alternative 5 offers a better form for change leadership activities by training counties within each consortium regionally, while allowing flexibility to make county specific visits.

While Alternative 4 minimizes travel for the WDTIP Implementation Team, it increases travel requirements for county trainers. Alternative 5 brings more balance between the resource requirements for both the counties and WDTIP Implementation Team. Alternative 5 also promotes better county buy-in by bringing training regionally to consortium counties and to counties that require separate training outside of consortium and regional training, based on the rollout schedule.

7.7 Strategy Detail

7.7.1 Analysis

During the analysis phase, we will gather information to formulate a detailed training plan. Activities during the analysis phase include:

- **Assessing Training Needs.** The WDTIP Implementation Team sent out a WDTIP Implementation Questionnaire to assess training needs for each county. During the regional meetings with counties in October 1999, the participants will identify the target group of trainees (end users), and assess the training needs of each group. A number of questions will be posed to assess the learning needs of each group.
- **Identifying the Target Audience.** The WDTIP Implementation Team will first identify end users and then identify the WDTIP functions that they will need to be trained to use. The information may be gathered through surveys and discussions with county representatives, WDTIP State representatives and WDTIP vendors.
- **Identifying the Course Content for the Train-the-trainer Session.** The train-the-trainer course includes WDTIP system training. Some counties have expressed the need to include a trainer course for trainers, in addition to system training. This

course includes adult learning principles and hands on practice of delivering WDTIP system training.

- **Determining Post Rollout Training Needs.** Some counties may choose to train in a hands-on classroom setting before rollout, others after rollout. If counties choose to train after rollout, the WDTIP Implementation Team must assess the need for maintaining the training region.

7.7.2 Design

The results from the analysis phase will be used to design the curriculum, develop a training schedule and develop a detailed training plan. Activities during the design phase include:

- **Developing the Training Plan.** The results from assessing training needs and identifying the target audience will be used to develop the training plan. The training plan may include the train-the-trainer schedule, course delivery method and curriculum objectives.
- **Defining Course Content for the Train-the-trainer Session.** Results from the analysis phase will enable the WDTIP Implementation Team to determine the content of the train-the-trainer course. The train-the-trainer course may include instruction regarding how to be a trainer, as well as system training.
- **Determining Content of the End User's Course.** The course content will be outlined based on the results of the analysis phase. The content of the end user documentation will also be determined.
- **Coordinating with Counties/Consortia to Identify County Training Schedule.** This will help the WDTIP Implementation Team plan the train-the-trainer course timeline for just-in-time training and prepare the schedule for technical connectivity needs.

7.7.3 Development

After the course contents are defined and outlined, the WDTIP Implementation Team will develop the training courses. Activities during the development phase include:

- **Developing WDTIP End User Training Material**. This includes training manuals, handouts, learning activities, training database and user documentation.
- **Developing Train-the-trainer Material.** Based on the analysis phase, if the trainers require an additional session regarding how to be a trainer, which includes adult learning principles and hands-on practice of teaching the systems training course, material will be developed at this time.
- **Preparing the Training Region.** The training region is a separate region that simulates the production region, which may contain up-to-date screens and data for fictional program participants.

7.7.4 Implementation

During the implementation phase of training, the WDTIP Implementation Team performs a dry run using the training material developed for end users, and delivers training to trainers. Activities during the implementation phase include:

- **Delivering Pilot Training**. The WDTIP Implementation Team will deliver end user systems training to the –User Acceptance Testing Team.
- **Training County Trainers**. The WDTIP Implementation Team will train county trainers using the train-the-trainer approach.
- **Training End Users**. After attending the train-the-trainer course, county trainers will train county staff (end users) at their counties.

7.7.5 Maintenance

Maintenance involves maintaining the training material and the training region. Activities during the maintenance phase include:

- **Revising Training Material After Pilot Training.** Incorporate appropriate revisions to training material and the training database as required based upon pilot training and changes in system functionality.
- **Maintaining the Training Region.** The training region contains a copy of the WDTIP production screens and database, which will provide a comprehensive interactive environment to simulate the use of the production system. The data in the training region may need periodic updates and refreshes during the train-the-trainer program.

7.7.6 Evaluation

Formal evaluation activities occur after delivering training sessions. Activities during the evaluation phase include:

- **Conducting Informal Evaluations.** Evaluations occur during all phases of the instructional systems development lifecycle. Feedback received from these evaluations is consistently used to revise the course and the materials.
- **Conducting Course Evaluations.** Perform evaluation of pilot training sessions and materials and make revisions as required. Perform evaluation of train-the-trainer sessions and make adjustments given time constraints and as necessary.

8. Change Leadership Strategy

8.1 Objective

The objective of change leadership strategy analysis is to identify and evaluate the various options available to determine and document changes in welfare business processes resulting from implementation of the new WDTIP system. The WDTIP Implementation Team will also determine the most effective way to communicate business process changes to the counties, given specific assumptions and constraints.

8.2 Introduction and Definition

For the purposes of the WDTIP, change leadership is defined as the process by which business process changes are identified and implemented. For the new WDTIP system, a number of county business processes are expected to be impacted, specifically those associated with file clearance and determining initial and ongoing eligibility to the CalWORKs program.

The purpose of change leadership is to ensure that system users understand not only how business processes may change, but also the benefits of the proposed changes. Changes are more easily accepted, supported and implemented when the user has a thorough understanding of the reasons for the change.

The overall goal of the change leadership strategy is to facilitate and promote acceptance and use of the new system by all end users as well as to provide counties with the methodology and tools to identify business process changes and communicate those changes to the users.

8.3 Assumptions and Constraints

For the purpose of this analysis, the WDTIP Implementation Team has made assumptions and identified constraints in developing the change leadership strategy. These include:

8.3.1 Assumptions

- The new WDTIP system will primarily affect two distinct business processes: (1) file clearance and (2) determining eligibility. The business process changes affect the way counties conduct their business.
- Counties are already familiar with the Pre-SAWS system. The change in business process, therefore, should not be profound.
- Counties will be responsible for providing resources to assist with all change leadership activities within their respective counties, regardless of the approach selected.
- The system will be rolled out to all counties no later than July 31, 2000.
- The counties will have limited resources to dedicate to change leadership activities.

- The WDTIP Implementation Team will be competing against other county priorities and projects.
- Existing communication media will be utilized to communicate generic business process changes to all counties, regardless of the approach selected.

8.3.2 Constraints

- The training sessions and curriculum will be used to communicate generic business process changes, regardless of the approach chosen (therefore change leadership activities need to be completed prior to curriculum development and training).
- Implementing the changes in business processes specific to each county will need to take place after rollout has occurred.
- The WDTIP has limited resources to perform change leadership activities.

8.4 Alternative Analysis

8.4.1 Alternative Analysis Approach

To determine the preferred change leadership strategy, the WDTIP Implementation Team identified two options to conduct change leadership activities. The purpose of this alternative analysis is to determine which strategy provides the best approach to implementing change leadership in the counties. The best approach will be represented by the one strategy that best meets the evaluation criteria outlined in the section below, and adheres to our specific assumptions and constraints.

The alternative analysis will consist of the following steps:

- Identification of the criteria for evaluating the change leadership strategy alternatives
- Identification and description of the system change leadership strategy alternative
- Evaluation of each alternative in relation to the other
- Selection of the "best" strategy

8.4.2 Criteria for Evaluating Alternatives

In weighing the relative merits of each alternative, our assumptions, constraints and evaluation criteria were all considered. The table below explains the criteria used to measure the benefits and drawbacks of each alternative. The importance factor indicates the relative importance placed on the specified criteria, with "1" indicating most important, and "4" indicating least important. For example, it is very important for counties to actually implement the recommended change leadership practices. If counties are not committed to identifying process changes, the system will not be utilized effectively. Hence the *County Buy-in and Utilization of the System* criterion has been given a "1" importance factor. Similarly, the selected change leadership strategy is not expected to be incompatible with the rollout and training strategies, therefore the *Compatibility with the Rollout and Training Strategies* criterion was given an importance factor of "4." Note, however, that the importance factor should be used as a general measure of Project priorities and desired outcomes, not as an exact indicator of importance.

Table 8-1: Criteria for Evaluating Change Leadership Strategy Alternatives

Criteria	Description	Importance Factor
County Buy-in and Utilization of the System	Change leadership activities can facilitate county acceptance, which is the first step to ensuring that the system will be used. County acceptance is also important in promoting support for the Project. Because the success of any implementation effort relies heavily on user buy in, this criterion has been ranked the highest priority for evaluation.	1
Resource Requirements	The WDTIP Implementation Team and the counties have limited resources to conduct change leadership activities. The strategies will be evaluated based on the level of resources required to implement the approach. The selected strategy, therefore, must balance the attention given to counties with the restraints dictated by WDTIP resources.	2
Schedule	The overall timeframe for completion of WDTIP is aggressive, leaving little time for flexibility in tasks and schedules. Alternatives must work within already-specified schedules. Additionally, alternatives should not interfere with other State projects and county priorities.	3
Compatibility with Rollout and Training Strategies	The change leadership strategy should not negatively impact the Project's ability to execute training or to rollout the system to end users. A strategy that helps to simplify the training or rollout approach will be weighed with more favor than one that does not.	4

8.4.3 Change Leadership Alternatives

The following two alternatives represent the options WDTIP believes are viable for implementing change leadership activities. These alternatives were established through strategy discussions with State and vendor representatives from the WDTIP Team.

Alternative 1 – Identifying the High-Level Business Process Changes and Communicating Those Changes Using Existing Communication Media and Training Sessions. For this alternative, the WDTIP Implementation Team would develop high level change leadership plans (that include the high level business process changes), would communicate these through existing communication media and training sessions, and would provide support to the counties via templates and county visits. Along with the high-level business process changes common to all counties, the Implementation Team would provide counties with the methodology and tools necessary to customize the change leadership plan to meet the needs of each county and its system users. The Implementation Team would utilize the existing communication media detailed in the

Updated Stakeholder Communication Plan, train-the-trainer sessions, training curriculum and site visits if requested, to further communicate the common business process changes and to assist the counties in customizing their change leadership plans.

Because a generic change leadership plan will be developed for each of the counties to use as a template, the WDTIP Implementation Team could complete one plan for all 58 counties. Because the Implementation Team may be asked to visit more counties than time or resources will allow, the Implementation Team will develop criteria to determine the necessity of county visits when requested and also to prioritize those requests once deemed necessary.

Alternative 2 –Identifying County-Specific Business Process Changes and Communicating Those Changes by Conducting Site Visits and During Training Sessions. For this alternative, the WDTIP Implementation Team would assist counties with the development of county-specific change leadership plans through a variety of activities. First, the Implementation Team would identify high-level business process changes common to all counties and develop a change leadership approach. Not only would the Implementation Team disseminate this information to the counties so they may develop their county-specific change leadership plans, but the Team would also conduct county site visits to assist with the development of those change leadership plans. During these site visits, the Implementation Team would assist county staff with identifying the county-specific business process changes as a result of the WDTIP system. Once the changes have been identified and the plan completed (i.e., the changes are documented), the WDTIP Implementation Team would incorporate the changes into the training curriculum so that the appropriate staff will benefit from the change leadership plan.

This alternative will require the WDTIP Implementation Team to travel to all 58 counties and spend one to two days identifying and documenting the county-specific business process changes, requiring approximately 15 weeks to complete the activities.

8.5 Change Leadership Alternative Analysis

8.5.1 Summary of Results

The following section of the change leadership strategy provides the detailed analysis of the two options proposed above to develop and communicate change leadership plans. We have provided below a summary grid of our findings for each of the alternatives. In our summary grid, a "" indicates that, for the specified criteria, the alternative will not provide a favorable result as compared with other alternatives available. A ""indicates that, for the specified criteria, the alternative will provide a favorable result as compared with other alternatives available. The best alternative, therefore, is the one that is *relatively* better than the other options. A *Neutral* indicator indicates that the criterion is neither less nor more favorable compared to other alternatives considered.

Table 8-2: Summary of Alternative Analysis

Criteria	Alternatives	
	1 Generic	*2 County Specific*
1. County Buy-in and Utilization of the System	Neutral	
2. Resource Requirements		
3. Schedule		
4. Compatibility with Rollout and Training Strategies		

8.5.2 Pros and Cons

This section of the change leadership strategy presents the benefits (Pros) and drawbacks (Cons) of each of the strategies under consideration. This section represents the content of our analysis, and will determine which strategy provides the most efficient and complete solution to change leadership activities for the WDTIP. The Pros and Cons discussed here directly correlate to the evaluation criteria identified above.

Alternative 1: Identify the High-Level Business Process Changes and Communicate Those Changes Using Existing Communication Media and Training Sessions.

Pros	*Cons*
Minimal WDTIP resources will be required for this alternative because the WDTIP Implementation Team would develop one change leadership plan that will identify common business process changes and develop the methodology and tools that can be used by all counties. The common changes, methodology and tools will be disseminated to all of the counties at the same time. Additionally, requests for site visits will be limited to those counties with pre-existing complex business processes that may require assistance from the WDTIP Implementation Team.	Spending one-on-one time with counties may facilitate increased county acceptance and potentially more utilization of the WDTIP system than what is proposed here in Alternative 1. However, this criterion is rated as *Neutral* because the WDTIP Implementation Team intends to support and provide guidance to counties, as well as conduct site visits when necessary. This will promote county buy-in and utilization of the system, just not at the same level as Alternative 2.
Because this alternative limits site visits with counties, the WDTIP Implementation Team will have more control over which counties they visit and when. This will require less time and resources for site visits than Alternative 2.	

Pros	*Cons*
The time savings realized from limiting site visits make Alternative 1 much more likely than Alternative 2 to be compatible with the rollout and training strategies.	

Alternative 2: Identifying County-Specific Business Process Changes and Communicating Those Changes by Conducting Site Visits and During Training Sessions.

Pros	*Cons*
Conducting site visits and working directly with the staff of all 58 counties is much more likely to enhance county acceptance and increase utilization of the system than in Alternative 1 because changes can be tailored to meet the unique needs of the individual counties.	Traveling to and spending two to three days in each of the 58 counties will require an extensive amount of WDTIP resources. The limited number of WDTIP Implementation Team members may not support this approach.
	Given the existing resource level, conducting site visits to all 58 counties will take approximately three to four months, making it impossible for the WDTIP Implementation Team to complete the visits within the WDTIP timeframe/schedule and with the WDTIP's existing resources.
	Conducting 58 county visits will undoubtedly interfere with the training strategy. Additionally to ensure that all counties are visited within the WDTIP schedule, change leadership activities will have to start before rollout, which will negatively impact the rollout strategy.

8.6 Selected Change Leadership Strategy

Alternative 1
Identifying the High-Level Business Process Changes and Communicating Those Changes Using Existing Communication Media

Based on the above evaluation, Alternative 1 has been selected as the most appropriate approach for the WDTIP change leadership strategy. Although Alternative 2 ranked best for the most important criterion, *County Buy-in*, it will undoubtedly require greater WDTIP resources than Alternative 1 and will result in scheduling and compatibility issues. And, although achieving county buy-in will be easier with Alternative 2,

opportunities to achieve county buy-in and to promote and encourage use of the system do exist with Alternative 1.

8.7 Strategy Detail

Based on the above selected approach, future change leadership activities include:

- Gather information on high level current and future business process changes and identify the differences in the two
  - Use existing documentation, surveys, interviews, site visits and regional meetings as a forum to gather high-level business process change information
  - Compile survey results to determine how the process changes will differ and if the processes differ by county or by consortia
  - Determine if additional information will be needed. If so visit representative counties (by size, consortia and previous involvement)

- Evaluate information gathered and develop a high-level change leadership plan, as well as the methodology and tools
  - Analyze the high-level business process changes and determine the impact of the process changes
  - Include the process changes and impact analysis into a change leadership plan that can be used by all counties
  - Develop the methodology that counties will use to customize their county-specific change leadership plans
  - Incorporate the common change leadership plan into the training curriculum

- Communicate results, disseminate all necessary information and provide support
  - Communicate the high-level business process changes common to all counties through the existing communication media detailed in the **Updated Stakeholder Communication Plan**
  - Provide the counties will the methodology as well as tools to use to customize their plans
  - Provide support and guidance to the counties
  - Develop criteria to evaluate and help prioritize county site visits that are requested by the counties for assistance with development of the county specific change leadership plans
  - Conduct on-site visits

The details of the change leadership approach will be documented in the WDTIP **Implementation Plan**, due for submission in January 2000.

9. Help Desk Strategy

Introduction and Strategy Definition

The WDTIP Help Desk will provide support to the counties during implementation and ongoing use of the WDTIP system. Users can access the Help Desk via phone, fax, e-mail and regular mail to obtain assistance with or ask questions about the system, screens, reports and connectivity of the system. Users may also obtain information on current and future Project activities, as well as on Project status. In addition, the Help Desk will also serve as the vehicle for requesting changes to the system (see ***Section 10, Change Request Strategy***). The Help Desk staff at the HHSDC Cannery site will also provide second level help to the WDTIP.

All calls to the Help Desk will be tracked using Remedy. The Help Desk staff will answer any questions and will try to resolve any issues immediately after receiving a Help Desk ticket. However, if an issue cannot be resolved, the ticket will be forwarded to the appropriate WDTIP Team member, or the second level help and the Help Desk staff will notify the user of the status and the steps to be taken to resolve the issue.

Help Desk procedures were developed during the SAWS-TA Project. The WDTIP Implementation Team will update those procedures and adapt them for the purposes of this Project rather than develop an entirely new Help Desk strategy. These procedures will be finalized and included as a part of the **Implementation Plan**.

10. Change Request Strategy

Introduction and Strategy Definition

Change request is a process that provides stakeholders, including users, with a means to request changes, corrections or enhancements to the WDTIP system. External stakeholders will request changes by contacting the Help Desk (see Section 9, Help Desk Strategy). The request is recorded by the WDTIP Help Desk and forwarded to the Configuration Control Board where formal change request procedures will be initiated. These procedures include discussions regarding the best approach to resolving the request, approvals, execution and communication of the change. The resolution of the Board will be tracked by the Help Desk and notification will be sent to the requestor. All change requests will be tracked using the Project Tracking System.

Change request procedures were developed during the SAWS-TA Project. The WDTIP Implementation Team will update those procedures and adapt them for the purposes of this Project rather than develop an entirely new change request strategy. These procedures will be finalized and included as a part of the **Implementation Plan**.